to the removal of a technical objection by Congress, would be a strict and faithful and literal performance of duty by the Secre-

tary of the Treasury.

When you come to this particular transaction, the President has entered tentatively into a contract to buy the property named in the first and second sections of the act, the right to control it, absolute sovereignty over it, perpetual in its character, and the only point Senators can make against it is the purely technical point that it is bought of the Republic of Panama, which now owns it, instead of the Republic of Colombia, which has ceased to own it.

That is the sort of argument, Mr. President, which would "rail the seal from off the bond." An attack upon the President of the the seal from off the bond." An attack upon the President of the United States upon a ground like that is so virulent and inexcusable as to find no possible explanation, except upon the hypothesis of partisanship of the bitterest sort. We can not test the wish of Congress upon this if we choose. It is "up to us." You have a resolution pending here directing the President of the United States to turn his back on Panama, to leave it to a French fleet to protect the interests of the French people on that Isthmus, and to turn to Nicaragua and build the canal there. That can be brought to a vote. I should like to vote upon it to-morrow. I should like to see Senators line up on it. That would involve not speech, but action

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wis-

consin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him what resolution he refers to?

Mr. SPOONER. I understand that such a resolution was intro-

duced here within a day or two.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator does not, then, refer to the one we are supposed to be discussing?

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, no: but that is the way to raise that issue.

It is like the common law pleading, it brings the matter of controversy down to a point.

Mr. TELLER. Suppose the Senator introduces such a resolu-

tion then.

Mr. SPOONER. I would introduce it if it were not for the fact

Mr. SPOONER. I would introduce it if it were not for the fact that I hate to introduce a thing which I will not vote for.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let them introduce it.

Mr. SPOONER. It ought to be introduced. I challenge you to introduce it. If there is anything but partisanship in this attack upon the President, based upon the slimmest, thinnest technicality that ever was imported into debate, it ought to be introduced by some Senator virulent in attack, full of insinuation and suggestion of dishonor who is willing to yote for it after he and suggestion of dishonor, who is willing to vote for it after he has introduced it. The people then will see—
Mr. TILLMAN. If I had not promised to say nothing, I could

not remain silent after that; but I shall have to go out of the Chamber while the Senator is discussing any such wild vagaries as

those or I shall fail to keep my pledge.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I never thought—
Mr. TILLMAN. I intended that remark in no sense a discourtesy to the Senator [leaving the Chamber], but the Senator is

just like a disordered-

just like a disordered— [Laughter.]

Mr. SPOONER. That is the only absolutely successful controversy I have ever had with the Senator from South Carolina. [Laughter.] I have been surprised a good many times in my life

Laughter.] I have been surprised a good many times in my life, but I never looked forward to the time when, in the presence of the people of the United States, I would be rebuked by the Senator from South Carolina for indulging in wild vagaries.

Now, Mr. President, I have said, and it has taken a long time because of interruptions, all I desire to say about this particular phase of this case. The President of the United States, I know, needs no defense here from anyone. He is a law-abiding President, if we have ever had one; and I only wish to say in conclusion that if, when he found he could secure an adequate title clusion that if, when he found he could secure an adequate title for the canal which Congress preferred, he had failed to avail him-self of the opportunity because of this technical point on the law, in my judgment he would have lost something of the respect and admiration which the people of this country justly entertain for him as a brave, patriotic, frank man, who tries to do in substance as well as in letter what the law commands.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wiscon-

Mr. N.E.W.LANDS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin questioned the accuracy of my statement regarding certain instructions which I claimed had been given by the Executive prior to the creation of the Republic of Panama, amounting, in effect, to a declaration of war.

The Republic of Panama was created, according to the statement of those who assisted in its creation, at 6 o'clock in the evening of November 3, and on the 4th day of November notice.

Was given to our Government by a telegram addressed to it by

the Atlantic and Pacific waters dated November 2, from twentyfour to thirty-six hours prior to the creation of the Republic, as

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., November 2, 1903.

NASHVILLE, care American Consul, Colon:

NASHVILLE, care American Consul, Colon:

Maintain free and uninterrupted transit. If interruption threatened by armed force, occupy the line of railroad. Prevent landing of any armed force with hostile intent, either Government or insurgent, either at Colon, Porto Bello, or other point. Send copy of instructions to the senior officer present at Panama upon arrival of Boston. Have sent copy of instructions and have telegraphed Dixie to proceed with all possible dispatch from Kingston to Colon. Government force reported approaching the Isthmus in vessels. Prevent their landing if in your judgment this would precipitate a conflict. Acknowledgment is required.

DARLING. Acting Secretary.

DARLING, Acting Secretary.

And then another, addressed to the commander of the steamer Marblehead on the Pacific coast, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., November 2, 1903.

GLASS, Marblehead, Acapulco:

Glass, Marbiehead, Acapulco:

Proceed with all possible dispatch to Panama. Telegraph in cipher your departure. Maintain free and uninterrupted transit. If interruption is threatened by armed force, occupy the line of railroad. Prevent landing of any armed force, either Government or insurgent, with hostile intent at any point within 50 miles of Panama. If doubtful as to the intention of any armed force, occupy Ancon Hill strongly with artillery. If the Wyoming would delay Concord and Marblehead, her disposition must be left to your discretion. Government force reported approaching the Isthmus in vessels. Prevent their landing if in your judgment landing would precipitate a conflict.

DARLING, Acting.

So I insist that I was justified in my assertion that before the Republic of Panama was created, at a time when Colombia was in undisputed possession of the Isthmus and exercised undisputed sovereignty over it, a dispatch was sent to the armed vessels of the United States in Pacific and Atlantic waters instructing them to prevent the Government of Colombia from landing her troops

upon her own territory.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Nevada does not desire to proceed further to-night, and I should think it would be better to adjourn. I should, however, like to make an inquiry, which is, What is the status of the pending

resolution

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, if the resolution was not disposed of to-day, it was agreed that it should retain its place without prejudice; but under another unanimousconsent agreement the resolutions in relation to the Post-Office Department investigation would be first laid before the Senate in the morning, and then the resolution now pending.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not believe the Post-Office resolutions are likely to take a great deal of time.

Mr. TELLER. I suggest to Senators who have the Senate in

charge that it is late, and probably we had better adjourn.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I inquire, Mr. President, what will be my

status, then, to-morrow?

Mr. CULLOM. Has the Senator from Nevada concluded his

remarks

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have not.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Whenever the resolution again comes up the Chair will recognize the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 14, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 13, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION. Mr. GROSVENOR. On yesterday, during the general debate upon the appropriation bill, I was duly recognized by the Chairman upon an assignment of ten minutes accorded me by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] in charge of the bill, and I proceeded to occupy those ten minutes in making some—perhaps I may say able—remarks upon one or two topics

to which I addressed myself. Before leaving the Capitol to go to my boarding house I notified the RECORD messenger of the House of Representatives, who usually brings to Members the manuscript of their speeches, to bring that document to me last night as early as half past 7 o'clock; but I told him if anything should happen to him so that he could not get there that early, to come back between 11 and 12 o'clock and I would hand him the manuscript. This morning I all a significant of the property o was given to our Government by a telegram addressed to it by the "junta," so called. I have in my hand telegrams addressed by the Acting Secretary of the Navy to our naval vessels both in what my mental condition may have been yesterday. I am told

by the reporters that they sent the document to some Member of this House and that it has been suppressed; and the singular part of the transaction is that it does not even appear by the RECORD that I made any speech.

Now, I can not conceive it possible that any Member of this

House could have gotten that manuscript last night and kept it out of the RECORD. Whoever may have received the manuscript had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, I will not. I am utterly surprised to find that there is no trace whatever in the RECORD of my speech or of my having made a speech. I suppose I can get another copy written out from the notes of the reporter; but thus far I am wholly unable to trace any history of that momentous event.

Now I ask, Mr. Speaker, that I may have the opportunity to reproduce that speech and publish it in the RECORD as of to-day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that my colleague [Mr. Baker]

desired to make a statement in connection with that of the gentleman; and I think-

Mr. GROSVENOR. I can not imagine how the gentleman's

Mr. GROSVENOR. I can not imagine how the gentleman's colleague could have anything to do with the matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think that what has occurred is the result of misunderstanding or unfamiliarity on the part of my colleague with the method of procedure in these matters. I know that he had nothing to do with keeping the speech from the Record. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will give him the opportunity to explain the matter. That was his purpose when he sought to interpret the centleman sought to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK (to Mr. Fitzgerald). Has your colleague got

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I requested the reporters that I be furnished with a carbon copy of my remarks, having been informed that it is customary here for two copies to be furbeen informed that it is customary here for two copies to be furnished by the Official Reporters when such a request is made. The same was delivered to me at my house last evening. On perusing my remarks I was surprised to find that only one copy had been sent, but that with my remarks was a copy of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Grosvenor]. Having asked for two copies of my remarks and only one being sent, I supposed that the gentleman from Ohio had also been furnished with a copy of my remarks, so that he had a copy of mine as well as his own, as I had of his as well as my own. I had no idea that I was in possession of the original copy (as I may call it) of the gentleman's speech. I shall be gratified indeed to turn the speech over to the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a noval situation. I did not think my speech was of such vital importance that carbon copies should be furnished to anybody; and why I should not have had a call upon the telephone or some suggestion.

should not have had a call upon the telephone or some suggestion that my speech was straying about the town somewhere is some-

thing that I can not understand.

Mr. BAKER. I have already said, Mr. Speaker, that I asked that two copies, one a carbon copy, be made of my speech, and I was told that this would be done; and I assumed that the copy of the gentleman's speech which I received was one of two copies made by the Official Reporters of the House.

The gentleman has spoken of an attempt to suppress his speech. I hardly think a gentleman of his experience will assume that a new Member, entirely unfamiliar with methods of procedure here, would even think of such a thing as attempting to suppress the gentleman, considering his standing in this House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I did not say that anybody attempted to suppress my speech. I said that somebody had suppressed it.

[Laughter.

Mr. BAKER. So far as I know, there has been no suppression. A carbon copy was supplied to me, and I assume that another copy was in the possession of the Official Reporters of the House. Mr. Speaker, I was told that two copies would be made, of which only one was sent to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Record will be sup-

plied with the copy.

Mr. BAKER. May I have just a moment, Mr. Speaker, to continue for one sentence. I did not ask that I be furnished with a copy of the speech of the gentleman from Ohio, and have no idea why it was sent tome with my remarks. It was undoubtedly sent in error. in error.

[The following was omitted from the RECORD of January 12.

The following was omitted from the RECORD of January 12. It should have appeared in the RECORD at page 738, after the statement "Mr. Baker addressed the committee," etc.]

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes' time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I do not see about me either of the distinguished Representatives from the city of Cincinnati, and yet I do not feel that the challenge of the gentleman from New York ought to go entirely unanswered. I admit that

his experience in Cincinnati politics is of a very much later date than mine, and much more interesting to the particular gentle-man himself. He took part in that campaign of 1903 in favor of the "great Democrat, Tom Johnson," as he calls him. He made a great number of speeches appealing to the people there and telling them how poor they were and how much they were suffering; and having accomplished all that was apparently necessary to secure a great Democratic victory in Cincinnati, there was another county not far away which was a matter of a great deal of moment to the two parties because of its very close character politi-

The county of Highland had gone Democratic for the last three years, and in the emergency of the hour the Macedonian cry went up from the Democrats to send the gentleman from New went up from the Democrats to send the gentleman from New York up there to make that victory also as assured as the one in Cincinnati. The result of the election was that the majority against Tom Johnson in the city of Cincinnati and Hamilton County approximated 29,000, and for the first time in many years a clean sweep was made for the Republican ticket in Highland County. [Applause on the Republican side.] Therefore I do not wonder that my friend has some personal ill feeling toward the situation in Cincinnati—I mean the political situation. I regret that he should enjoy and feel so haven over the suffering regret that he should enjoy and feel so happy over the suffering of the people of that city. He says that the description of the suffering of these people, the fact that they are resorting to soup houses, and that the courts have suspended sentence in regard to petty larceny, that that news is "so good" he wants to get it all into the RECORD. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question? Mr. GROSVENOR. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio declines to yield. Mr. GROSVENOR. I am sorry that the gentleman should feel thus, and jollify over suffering. I am sorry that he feels and rejoices that the laboring men at Youngstown are not to be paid full wages. It may be that some good may come out of that if it is true, which I do not believe: nor do I believe that the statement he read is from the Associated Press. I shall have to have evidence of it before I believe it. I do think it is from some newspaper writer, and no doubt the gentleman has it; but that the Associated Press has put affoat such a statement as that I do not Associated Press has put afloat such a statement as that I do not

Now. Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to say to the gentleman from New York that the pay rolls of the manufacturing industries of the city of Cincinnati are to-day double what they were on the day McKinley was elected President of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] This both in numbers and in wages paid. I will undertake to say that the amount of suffering for food in the city of Cincinnati does not number one to-day where ten were numbered then.

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield for a ques-

tion on that point?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; I will not. Let me state in explanation of this newspaper article from Cincinnati. The city of Cincinnati is bordered by the Ohio River. Front street and the streets to which the gentleman has referred in that article are crowded with laborers connected with the Ohio River transportation—rousiabouts, workers on steamboats, handlers of freight, brought together by the enormous traffic that goes out and comes brought together by the enormous traffic that goes out and comes into Cincinnati from the river. For the last three weeks or more the Ohio River has been barred by the presence of ice. Gorges above the city and gorges below the city have entirely suspended navigation in the Ohio River, and consequently, and necessarily, temporarily, a few people have doubtless been thrown out of employment and thrown out of their usual supply of food.

Beyond that any citizen of the city of Cincinnati will laugh at a man who undertakes to say that there are soon houses in the city.

man who undertakes to say that there are soup houses in the city man who undertakes to say that there are soup houses in the city of Cincinnati made necessary by the condition of hard times. He refers to Mike Mullen. I believe Mike Mullen is now a Republican. There was a time when he was an influential Democrat, and not so very long ago, either. He is not so influential now, but he has got into a class of people in the city of Cincinnati who doubtless belong to an organization headed, for political purposes, by Mr. George B. Cox. Inasmuch as a Member of Congress, who we have belong to an organization headed, as well as the congress of the congress probably does not know the man, probably never saw him, but simply takes rumor for it, unless somebody should be misled by simply takes rumor for it, thieses somebody should be missed by this talk, I want to say what I do not hesitate to say, that there is not a better, more public-spirited, upright citizen of Cincinnati today than George B. Cox. He is at the head of a great business concern, and his word in politics and in business is good among his neighbors. That may sound strange to some gentlemen, but does anybody suppose that in a city of the intelligence and wealth of Cincinnati, with the public schools and colleges of Cincinnati, a bad man can inflict a bad government upon that city for twenty years on a stretch without once being overthrown by the popular vote of the city?

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, again, there is not a city govern-

ment in the United States of America that can produce the evidence of good government, absolutely good government, that can compare with the city of Cincinnati. It has a mayor of high character, a gentleman, popular, strong, efficient, and able; a board of public affairs of the highest character in the city of Cincinnati; the judges on the bench are the very ablest men at the bar in Hamilton County: a tax rate in the city only about half of the tax rate of Cleveland-

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield for a question on that point?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will not. The city improvements are carried on in the very best possible and economical manner, and the great body of the citizens approve of the local government.

Two years ago last spring this same cry went up, and the result of it was a sweeping victory for the present mayor of Cincinnati. Last spring again the same cry went up, and yet with a tremendous vote Mr. Fleischman was again reelected mayor of the city by a large majority. It is a city representing wealth, intelligence, patriotism, vi tue; and because Mr. Cox manages local politics is no reason why he should be assailed here, and an indirect attack made upon all the people of the city of Cincinnati. I do not believe in these assaults upon the great cities of my country. I do not justify any assault upon the city of New York. I certainly do not justify any assault upon the new and young and bright may or of the city of New York, who is respected and beloved by us all. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And by that simple spirit of Americanism and patriotism, I challenge the man who assails the city of Cincinnati and its officers. [Applause.]

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE-BONYNGE VS. SHAFROTH.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, by direction of Committee on Elections No. 2. I offer for present consideration the privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Committee on Elections No. 2 shall be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an expert in handwriting to pass upon such matters or questions as shall be submitted to him by said committee or any subcommittee thereof in the contested-election case of Bonynge v. Shafroth, from the First Congressional district of Colorado, the expense of employing such expert to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say just a word. In the contested-election case referred to in the resolution, and which has been referred to Committee on Elections No. 2, a question arises concerning the handwriting on a large number of the ballots. Under the law of Colorado each voter is required to do certain writing on his own ballot, in his own hand, in the privacy of the election booth. It is alleged that, in violation of that law, some of the official ballots were improperly secured and prepared in advance by other parties and found their way into the ballot boxes. The ballots were secured and impounded by the parties to the contest in Colorado, but were not examined there. They to the contest in Colorado, but were not examined there. were brought to our committee in sealed packages. There statements were made by the parties to the contest as to what would probably be disclosed by those ballots. The ballots were brought before the full committee. The package containing those from one precinct was opened. We saw at once that it was impossible for the full committee to compare the handwriting upon several the problem of the p thousand ballots, and a subcommittee was appointed

That subcommittee have unanimously reported to the full committee that they need an expert. As to some matters the subcommittee have no difficulty whatever, but as to others they do not like to risk their own judgment, and they insist that such an expert is necessary to enable them to determine the questions involved as to the handwriting upon some of these ballots and possibly in

some of the poll books.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a ques-

Mr. OLMSTED. Certainly.
Mr. CLARK. How long would it take this expert to get through with this business?
Mr. OLMSTED. The subcommittee think it might take him a

week or ten days.

Mr. CLARK. How much is it going to cost?

Mr. CLARK. How much is it going to cost?

Mr. OLMSTED. I do not know. I am told that some of these experts are high priced; others are not so costly.

Mr. CLARK. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa yesterday, if I understood him correctly, said that a stenographer wanted him to certify a bill for \$43 for an hour and ten minutes' work. Now, if anybody is to be paid that sort of price, I object. I have no objection to a reasonable pay.

Mr. SHAFROTH. As I understand, everybody in the committee was perfectly unanimous for this. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have it.

Mr. CLARK. Then let it go on.

Mr. TALBOTT. It is absolutely necessary to have an expert. The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to the resolu-

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.
On motion of Mr. Olmsted, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. Needham, for two days, on account of sickness in family. To Mr. Dickerman, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve inself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 9480, being the legisla-

tive, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill

H. R. 9:80, the legislative appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to. The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. TAWNEY in the

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of

the House bill 9480, the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask what was the pending motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor

for five minutes' time, being yielded to him yesterday.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to

me for a moment?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Not to come out of his time, so that I may ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman, but do

not yield the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. In order to aid in perhaps necessary information in the debate on the civil-service appropriation I ask the reading of a letter from the Civil Service Commission that will make clear the inquiry made yesterday by the gentleman from Iowa. It will take but a minute, and that not out of the time of

my friend.
Mr. BARTLETT. Not out of my time.
Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent for the reading of the letter

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk read as follows:

United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., January 13, 1:64.

Hon. HENRY H. BINGHAM, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Henry H. Bingham,
Washington, D. C.
My Dear General Bingham: Mr. Courts, clerk of your committee, has just telephoned me asking for a statement as to the number of employees carried on the rolls of other Departments of the Government who, either incidentally or exclusively, are doing civil-service work on boards of examiners. In reply I beg to submit the following statement:

There are at present sixteen who, although carried on the rolls of other Departments, are working exclusively for the Commission. Of this number, six are in Boston, five in New York, two in Philadelphia, two in Chicago, and one in San Francisco. The Boston board handles applications, makes certifications, and is charged with the actual conduct of the examinations for all of New England. The New York board is organized for the purpose of doing the same work for a large section of New York State and a part of New Jersey. I might also add that for convenience two counties in Connecticut have been detached from the New England district and put under the jurisdiction of our secretary in New York.

The Philadelphia district covers the portion of New Jersey not cared for from New York, the State of Delaware, and over half of the State of Pennsylvania. The Chicago district includes all Federal offices in the city of Chicago, and the San Francisco. Employees belonging to other branches of the public service have for a number of years been assigned exclusively to the work of the Commission in the cities named, but it was only recently that the Commission found it necessary to consolidate a number of civil-service boards into districts, so as to save officials at a distance the necessity of communicating directly with the Commission in connection with civil-service work which can as well be done by representatives of the Commission conveniently located in civil-service districts.

By this plan the Commission expects to secure closer supervision and greater dispatch in the work and a more effective administration of the civil-service law and rule

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Parkinson, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2842. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize

the Montgomery Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Alabama River near the city of Montgomery, Ala.," approved March 1, 1893;

S. R. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the erection and maintenance of a statue in memory of the late President Benjamin Harrison upon land owned by the United States in the city of Indiangualis State of Indiana. apolis, State of Indiana;

S. R. 32. Joint resolution to fill vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. 2820. An act for the relief of Hamilton D. South; and S. 1753. An act for the relief of Pay Clerk Charles Blake, United States Navy.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without

The message also announced that the senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 9160. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904," approved March 3, 1903; and

H. R. 9866. An act making appropriations for clearing the Potomac River of ice and for the removal of snow and ice in the

District of Columbia.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the letter just read contains, because I did not hear it and could not

hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. The House will please be in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know that it had any reference to the particular subject to which I undertook yesterday afternoon to call the attention of the House, and that was the violation of the law by the Civil Service Commission in the matter of the appointment of Michael W. Louis to the position of superintendent of the division of supplies in the Post-Office Department, as is set out in the report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General and transmitted to Congress by the President, with his memorandum

transmitted to Congress by the President, with his memorandum upon it containing his most cordial approval of what the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General had done, and what he had said to the President, and what the President through him says to the

I had no sooner taken the floor, Mr. Chairman, than my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] asked me a ques-tion which injected politics into the discussion. The gentleman asked me to point out one man mentioned in this report who was

guilty of fraud and corruption.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentle-

man permit me a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman insists, yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I was interrupted when I reached

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I was interrupted when I reached that point, and my question was this—

Mr. BARTLETT. I have that question here.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I understand, but you will see by what follows that I had not completed my question. My further question was this, Was one of the indicted persons appointed under the civil-service law or how many? That is the question.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know. We know when the civil-service was not in force.

service was put in force.

The President in his memorandum, Mr. Chairman, on pages 7 The President in his memorandum, Mr. Chairman, on pages 7 and 8 of this document which I hold in my hand, being the report of the Postmaster-General in the investigation of the Post-Office Department, transmitted here on December 5, sets forth a list of the men in the Post-Office Department who had been indicted, accused, and discharged from the post-office service on account of alleged offenses—and I use the word "alleged" because I do not stand here on the floor of this House to charge that any man is milky of crime especially when these men must undergo trial guilty of crime, especially when those men must undergo trial in the courts.

I do not undertake to say, nor deem it to be my place—whatever I may believe the proper conclusion to draw from the evidence furnished from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General's report, who is a good Republican and a high official in the councils of the Republican party—I do not deem it proper that I, as a Representative here, whatever may be my belief, especially when some of these men are now on trial in the courts of this city and charged with many violations of the law, should say they are guitty of the offenses charged.

But. Mr. Chairman, I do say that these frauds, so characterized.

by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, and called by the President "corrupt practices," some of them, at least, would not have occurred (in one particular, at least, the case of the appointment of the chief of the supply division in the Post-Office Department), might not have been perpetrated, unless the Civil Service Commission had permitted the irregular and unlawful appointment of this official. The Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General in this report ascribes the violations of the laws to the fact that the Civil Service Commission had violated the law.

The rules and the regulations which they themselves had pre-

The rules and the regulations which they themselves had presented were and the law upon the statute books as to this appointment was undoubtedly violated. That is what I desire to present to this House. I did not intend to call any attention to the politics of the men said to have been engaged in these great frauds. The matter is not whether a man is a Democrat, or a Republican and the said of the men said to have been engaged in these great frauds. or a Populist, but it is a matter of concern whether he has de-frauded the Government, or whether the party in power and the officials under whom he works have been guilty of negligence in

officials under whom he works have been guilty of negligence in not discovering the frauds.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Georgia be extended ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.]

The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I say that the President called attention to the number of men who were implicated in the wrongdoing and frauds committed in the Post-Office Department; next, those who have been indicted by the courts and those who have been discharged, or who have not been indicted; and those who have been discharged, or who have not been indicted; and, upon investigation, out of that thirty-four or thirty-five—I do not undertake to be quite accurate—I find that there are only four who were appointed either under the civil-service law or otherwise while the Democratic party was in control of the Government. The other thirty or thirty-one went into office either as appointees of Republican officials or under the civil service while the Republican party was in charge of the administration of the Govern-

Now, I did not intend to made any suggestion of this kind, but my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] hardly permitted me to utter three words after I took the floor before he permitted me to utter three words after I took the floor before he came in with the inquiry with reference to politics. Now, you gentlemen may make all you want to out of this list. It is not a list prepared by a Democrat; it is not a charge made by a Democrat; it is not a charge made by Democrat; it is not a charge made by Democratic officials. It is a charge made by an earnest Republican from the State of Kansas, who stands high in the councils of the present Administration, and whose work has been indorsed and approved by the President of the United States, and whose conclusions are said by the President to have been fully instified by the facts. dent to have been fully justified by the facts.

Now, as a part of the case, I desire to call attention to the part Now, as a part of the case, I desire to call attention to the part of the report which I put into the Record of this one instance. I have not time to call attention to more, but I call attention to this because it is on the very threshold of this report. It meets you at the start, at the very door, and stands out as a bold, bald violation of the law; and the man who violated the law, the man who encouraged it, the man who started it, the man who asked it, is a former First Assistant Postmaster-General, Perry S. Heath, now secretary of the national Republican committee

I have put it into the Record. It showed a violation of the law, and that violation of law was known to and permitted by the Civil Service Commission. There was appointed a cashier at the post-office in Kansas City, Mo. By a letter, which I put into the Record, dated April 17, 1897, when Mr. Heath had hardly got accustomed to his new duties, he asked that this man Louis

be appointed cashier in the post-office at Kansas City, Mo., and carried there on the pay roll of that post-office, and that his vouchers would not be signed there, but would be sent from here.

Immediately upon his appointment, never having gone to Kansas City, never having performed a minute's work in that office, what was done with him? Why, he was appointed chief of the division of supplies in the Post-Office; and how did they make a manager? These had been a men filling this position in the office. avacancy? There had been a man filling this position in the office for over a year. His position was in the classified service, but it does not appear, says the report, that any complaint was ever filed against him; he was not charged with inefficiency or misconduct. On April 15 he was requested to resign by the First Assistant Postmaster-General, but submitted his resignation to take effect after thirty days, and he was given leave of absence for that period.

ome of these men are now on trial in the courts of this city and tharged with many violations of the law, should say they are uity of the offenses charged.

Two days after that the place was filled by pretending to put the man in the office at Kansas City, Mo., and then immediately, almost with the same stroke of the pen, on the same date, appointing him to this office made vacant by the First Assistant Postmas-

ter-General; and what does this officer making this report say with reference to it?

On the same day he was appointed; he never had visited Kansas City; never performed any work of any character in connection with the Kansas City post-office.

After he had been appointed superintendent in that position he After he had been appointed superintendent in that position he was asked to be excepted from the provision of the rules of the civil-service law. Right here I will say that I intended to secure a report of the Civil Service Commission for last year, but I have not been able to get it. I wanted to see how many more exceptions there may be from the law governing this great Commission that is to protect the Government from the spoils system at the instance of high officials. I understand that if the inquiry could be made and an answer procured, they would be more numerous in the past year than they have been under the Administration of any other former Republican or Democratic President. I do not know the truth of it—I am simply informed that such is the fact.

Here is what the Civil Service Commission did: They gave him a special examination, and when he came to be examined, to show why he was competent above everybody else, simply because by this illegal appointment he had had three months' service in the Post-Office Department the Civil Service Commission said

the Post-Office Department the Civil Service Commission said that they would give him a rating of 50 out of 100 in order that he might get the position. That is to say, they gave him the position on account of the proficiency he had acquired because of three months' service in this Department of the Government.

Of course this was given to him as a mere gratuity, given to him by this Commission, which stands guard over the interests of the people and their rights in order that the "spoilsmen," the representatives of the people, who are said to be the Members of Congress, elected by the people, the "spoilsmen" of the country, may not put their friends in office. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this Commission rated this official, who had never performed any service for the Government beyond three months, at fifty—granting him a bonus of fifty—in his marking in order that he granting him a bonus of fifty—in his marking in order that he might secure this appointment. This was because of a three-months' service.

He was recommended over everybody else, and as a matter of course, as says the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, he received the highest grade of anyone examined and was given a permanent appointment. When it was noised about that this was a peculiar case, one that the First Assistant Postmaster-General had inaugurated, one that the Civil Service Commission had winked at and had indorsed, when some one instigated an investigation, when President Roosevelt said no matter who was guilty he should be found out and prosecuted—and I certainly give him my approval for that and doubt not that he was honest in that statement, for whatever else may be said about him, I do not believe that he at least intends to cover up frauds in the Government service—when this investigation was about to be made, and inquiry was had how this Civil Service Commission, these watchdogs of the rights of the people and of applicants for office, had permitted this irregular and illegal transfer and appointment, what was the rough?

The examination papers of this man who had been promoted into service over and against the rules can not be found, but con-veniently disappeared from the files of the Civil Service Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may have his time extended five minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Now, I have here a rule of this Commission with reference to transfers and the appointment of men, something that stood in the way of this matter. I read from the report of the Civil Service Commission made on June 30, 1902, which is the latest one upon which I have been able to lay my hands, there being none later in the document room or anywhere else that I could find.

Rule IV with reference to classification of temporary employees. Rule IV, with reference to classification of temporary employees and their transfers, reads as follows:

Such persons shall not be eligible for transfer to positions in the Departments at Washington, except after service of six months and under the conditions prescribed in civil-service Rule X, and upon a statement by the head of the Department requesting the transfer that the conditions of good administration demand the appointment of the person nominated, because of some special requirement of the place or qualifications of the person for the place which can not otherwise be reasonably met.

Here is a rule of this Commission under which was permitted the temporary employment when the man had not been employed for a day or an hour in the service. Here is a Civil Service Com-mission which permitted him to be transferred instanter into the

Department of the Post-Office in charge of one of its great divisions. As suggested by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General in his

As suggested by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General in his report, he was appointed in order that he might aid those who desired to defraud the Government, or rather to have the Government pay extravagant prices for material to be furnished it.

I do not use my own language, but I use that of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General. So that, Mr. Chairman, to conclude the proposition upon which I started, and started solely to call to the attention of this House, I would say that if this is a sample of what the Civil Service Commission permits to be done in the administration of its office—and that it is a correct example does not depend upon my assertion, but is such an example as is

of the administration of its office—and that it is a correct example does not depend upon my assertion, but is such an example as is stated to be taken from the proofs and the records of the Government, furnished by its officers—then it is time that we had a change.

I should like to ask whether this is an example of the way the Government is protected from spoilsmen? I doubt not there can be found many examples of like character of the evasion, the suspension, the violation of the civil-service law. If this is an example of the administration of the Government under the civil-service law, I think the people would welcome the day when the old system of "spoils" (if you choose to call it so) might return, when at the suggestion or on the recommendation of their Representatives in Congress they secured far abler, far more efficient service at the hands of the Government employees than they have received from those appointed and carried upon the rolls in the service of

the Government under this pretended system of civil service.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no speech to deliver on this occasion. I did not think of saying anything at all on the pending amendment until this morning after calling at the office of the Civil Service Commission to see whether the at the office of the Civil Service Commission to see whether the gentleman from Mississippi or I was correct last night in our respective contentions as to how certain former officials of the Post-Office Department now under indictment were appointed. Nor did I intend last evening to inject politics into this discussion.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Just one word, if the gentleman will

permit me

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield except for a

question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. After the gentleman's question of yester-day I am quoted in the RECORD as saying that Mr. Machen came regularly through the civil service into his position. I have a letter from the Civil Service Commission and I desire to say that if the statement of the Civil Service Commission this morning is correct he was covered by the blanket order of the President and did not go through in the regular way.

Mr. LANDIS. I should like to ask the gentleman—
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have the data concerning this

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have the data concerning this matter and will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman will remember that I had made no statement in reference to Mr. Machen being in office under the civil-service law, or anyone else.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If gentlemen will allow me to proceed, I think that there will be no trouble about anybody being

Last evening the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] in one of his very forceful speeches inveighed powerfully against the principle of the civil-service law and especially against the manner of its enforcement. He, in effect, asserted that conditions under the old system were better than the conditions of to-day. That statement has just been reiterated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Bartlett]. Last evening the gentleman from Georgia declared that nothing could better show the truth of what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hepburn] had said than the report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, giving an account of the alleged frauds in the Post-Office Department.

What does that mean? The only conclusion to be drawn from this statement of the gentleman from Georgia was that the mean in the Post-Office Department who have been charged with frauds.

in the Post-Office Department who have been charged with frauds were appointed under the civil-service law, which the gentleman from Iowa had condemned. There is no other interpretation to be put upon it. Thereupon I interrupted the gentleman from Georgia to ask him to tell who of the men charged with these frauds had been appointed under the civil-service law, but was myself interrupted before finishing my question. Both the reporter and the gentleman from Georgia misunderstood what I had in mind, and, in fact, what I did say.

But the gentleman from Mississippi understood what I asked, and he appropriate the process of the process of the process.

and he answered my question, as appears by the RECORD.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know whether they are guilty. I do not say they are guilty. Some of them are now being tried and their guilt will be determined by the courts. I say that the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General—Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, name Machen.

From this remark of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams], the leader of the Democratic minority, it is perfectly

clear that he understood me to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Bartlett] to name, not the men mentioned in the Bristow report who were "guilty," but which of them had been appointed under the civil-service law. And the gentleman from Mississippi suggested the name of Mr. Machen. He understood my question are I intended it and as it ought to appear in the Broom

suggested the name of Mr. Machen. He understood my duestion as I intended it and as it ought to appear in the Record.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman says that the remark ought to be in the Record. I hope he does not mean to say that anything has been taken out of the Record.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Oh, no; the reporter misunderstood, as the gentleman from Georgia evidently does now. Then Lorid is really to the gentleman from Mississippi. I said in reply to the gentleman from Mississippi:

Oh, Machen was a Democrat, not appointed under the civil service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin

[Mr. COOPER] has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask for ten minutes more.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended

five minutes Mr. HULL. I ask that the extension be for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin will be extended ten minutes.

There was no objection. Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I said [reading]:

Oh, Machen was a Democrat, appointed—not under the civil service.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi. No. he was appointed under the civil service and kept there under the civil service.
Mr. Cooper of Wisconsin. He never went through under civil-service rules at all.
Mr. Livingston. Oh, yes, he did.

Now, I have here a complete, authentic statement as to how Mr. Now, I have here a complete, authentic statement as to how Mr. Machen was appointed. I say nothing as to his guilt or innocence. He went into the Post-Office Department as a Democrat, appointed three years before his particular position was put under the civil-service law. He was appointed Superintendent of Free Delivery, at \$3,000 per annum, in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General, August 22, 1893, without examination. This position passed from the excepted to the competitive class on May 6, 1896, three years after his appointment. He was promoted to General Superintendent of Free Delivery, at \$3,500 per annum, on April 29, 1901, to take effect July 1, 1901. He was removed from the service on May 27, 1903.

service on May 27, 1903.

Mr. Beavers was appointed to the service in 1890, years before this position was placed under the civil-service law. Every one of the officials of the Post-Office Department the worlds evidence of the post-Office Department the world evidence of the post-Office Department the world evidence of the post-Office Department the world evidence of the post-Office Department evid for peculations and frauds went in under the spoils system, excepting only one man, Mr. Louis, late superintendent of post-office supplies. Every one was appointed by the request of a politician.

And now I will answer the statement read by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Bartlett] concerning Mr. Louis, the sole civil-service appointee now under indictment, and the manner of the Eventlement. This statement is from the report of the Eventlement.

his appointment. This statement is from the report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, and somewhat criticises the Civil-

Service Commission.

The late Mr. John R. Procter, former president of the Civil Service Commission a Democrat, and a very superior public official, wrote an answer to this statement in the report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General. By the way, I myself have nothing to say in criticism of Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General Bristow. In my judgment, he has successfully accomplished one of the most thoroughly difficult tasks undertaken by an executive officer of this Government in a century.

John R. Procter saw the report of the Fourth Assistant Post-

master-General, and he wrote a letter to the Postmaster-General in reply to the allegations in that report, to which the gentleman from Georgia has referred. This letter was dated on December

1, 1903, a little time before he died.

DECEMBER 1, 1903.

The honorable the POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

SIR. The Commission invites your attention to the following quotation from the abstract of the report of Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General Bristow on the investigation in the Post-Office Department which has been furnished the press:

And this is the quotation from Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General Bristow's report:

On April 17, 1897, Michael W. Louis, of Cincinnati, was appointed cashier in the Kansas City, Mo., post-office, and was detailed to the Department as acting superintendent of the supply division. The Civil Service Commission was asked to except the position from the classified service. This the Commission declined; but in July following it did give a special examination, allowing Louis a rating of 50 points for experience acquired during the three months he had been in charge of the division. As a result of this rating Louis passed a successful examination and was appointed.

General Bristow is a most excellent officer. I do not wonder that in the turmoil that has been around General Bristow, in the perfect whirlpool into which he has been plunged, he may have erred slightly in some minor details. But it does not touch his integrity, his honor as a man, or his patriotism as a public official that he has made a slight and unimportant error. It does,

however, reflect somewhat upon the accuracy of my eloquent friend from Georgia [Mr. Bartlett], who has been so severe in denunciation of the Civil Service Commission, presided over by John R. Procter, that he did not stop to inquire into the facts and see whether Mr. Procter and the Commission had made a defense

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman— Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield now. Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is very courteous—very

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield. Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This is what Mr. Procter said in

In reply, you are advised that the statement that a special examination was given and that Louis was allowed a rating of 50 points for experience acquired during the three months he had been in charge of the division is misleading and incorrect. The facts in the case are these: A request was received from the Post-Office Department—

Not from a Member of this House, not from a Senator, but

from an executive officer in the Post-Office Department—
Mr. BARTLETT. The First Assistant Postmaster-General.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (reading):

that the position of superintendent of post-office supplies be excepted from examination, with a view to the appointment of Louis, special attention being called to his long experience and superior qualifications for the position. The Commission declined to except the position and announced an open commission declined to except the position and announced an open commission. petitive examination

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. And then they gave him 50 points. Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (reading):

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (reading):

An open competitive examination consisting of two subjects—first, experience and qualifications, and, secondly, practical questions. Each of these subjects was weighted 50 per cent, and competitors were rated according to the value of their experience and their knowledge of the practical questions. Louis was given no rating for experience in the position to which he was temporarily appointed, but was given a high rating for the evidence submitted by him showing his experience in various positions, covering a period of many years, as tending to qualify him for the position of superintendent of post-office supplies.

It appeared that he was employed for several years as foreman in a publishing house in Cincinnati and for several years in a supervisory capacity in the press room of the Government Printing Office. It was regarded that in each of these positions he was enabled in the discharge of his duties to acquire a knowledge of the quality of inks, paper, etc., which knowledge was considered essential in the discharge of the duties of the position of superintendent of post-office supplies. In answer to the practical questions Louis also showed a knowledge of the examination.

Not a special examination for the benefit of Louis alone, but

Not a special examination for the benefit of Louis alone, but an open examination in which participated fourteen competitors.

Louis received the highest rating, which rating was regarded as indicating his relative qualifications for the position.

As the report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General has been given wide publicity, the Commission requests that the facts in regard to the examination and appointment of Louis be correctly stated.

By direction of the Commission:

(Signed)

JOHN R. PROCTER, President.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have not time to yield. The
gentleman from Iowa said that conditions are worse to-day than
they were before the law was enacted, worse than under the old spoils system. Let me read what James A. Garfield said in an article in the Atlantic Monthly in 1877.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I wish the gentleman would correct in the notes the statement of what "the gentleman from Ohio said." I

have not said anything yet.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Iowa! But I do not think that I would have erred if I had said "the remarks the gentleman from Ohio is going to make." [Laughter. Mr. GROSVENOR. That is right. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Here is what Garfield said:

One-third of the working hours of Senators and Representatives is hardly sufficient to meet the demands made upon them in reference to appointments in office. * * *

The present system * * impairs the efficiency of the legislators; * * it degrades the civil service; * * * it repels from the service those high and manly qualities which are so necessary to a pure and efficient administration; and, finally, it debauches the public mind by holding up public office as the reward of mere party zeal.

To reform this service is one of the highest and most imperative duties of statesmanship.

In a speech on this floor Mr. Garfield said, on the 4th of March,

We press such appointments upon the Departments: we crowd the doors; we fill the corridors: Senators and Representatives throng the offices and bureaus until the public business is obstructed; the patience of officers is worn out, and sometimes, for fear of losing their places by our influence, they at last give way and appoint men, not because they are fit for their positions, but because we ask it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask that my time may be extended ten minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask the gentleman what document he is reading from?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am reading from a Senate re-

port on the civil service, 1882.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that his time be extended ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Garfield continues further:

There, Mr. Chairman, is, in my judgment, the true field for retrenchment and reform.

President Grant, speaking of the great evils in 1870 of the spoils system, says:

There is no duty which so much embarrasses the Executive and heads of Departments as that of appointment, nor is there any such thankless labor imposed on Senators and Representatives as that of finding places for constituents. The present system does not secure the best men, and often not even fit men, for the public places. The elevation and purification of the civil service of the Government will be hailed with approval by the whole people of the United States.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to what Senator Vest said:

When I entered the Senate I became chairman of the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, and for two years I was engaged with the rest of that committee in taking testimony upon the subject of civil-service reform. That very great evils exist there can be no sort of question—evils so monstrous, so deadly in their effects, that men of all political parties have come to the conclusion that some remedy must be applied.

* * * * *

That evils exist there can be no sort of question. Money has become the great factor in the politics of the United States.

Senator Bayard said:

No man obtained an office except he was a violent partisan, and the office was given to him as a reward for party services; and so things went on until the offices generally were filled under that system, which was false and dangerous in the extreme—a system which, as my friend from Ohio said, is absolutely fatal to the integrity of republican institutions, I care not what party or under what name it may be organized and carried on.

I regret that I have not time to read extracts which I have here from the report of a committee of which John C. Calhoun and Daniel Webster were members—two men who represented as much of intellectual power and unsullied patriotism as any leg-

much of intellectual power and unsulled patriotism as any legislative body ever knew. This great committee united in saying that unless the spoils system, which a few years before had been inaugurated, were destroyed, it would ultimately lead to the breaking down of republican institutions.

The present civil-service law, honestly administered, allows anybody, the hod carrier's son and the son of the millionaire, if they wish to enter the service of the Government, to go before the Commission on equal terms to be examined; and if upon the examination the hod carrier's son proves to be the better fitted of the amination the hod carrier's son proves to be the better fitted of the two, the law declares him entitled to the appointment. And he

ought to have it.

That is the civil-service law. It is based upon the principle that the office belongs to the people, not to the officeholder, and that the people are entitled to the best possible trained service of employees in the business departments of the Government, just as the stockholders of a corporation engaged in manufacturing are entitled to the best trained service of its employees. Now, it is not claimed that the law is always perfectly administered. The Civil Service Commission, on page 27 of their seventeenth

annual report, say:

The Commission does not wish it understood by anything that has been said under this topic that there is an absence of irregularities and violation of the civil-service laws and rules—

We do not say that there is no burglary simply because we have a statute against burglary, but we do not propose to repeal the law because some men violate it—

or that the system is yet working with entire satisfaction, for such is far from being the case; but the foregoing is set out to indicate the steady and gratifying improvement in this direction.

I regret I have not time to elaborate upon this.

Rule 12, clause 2, says:

Rule 12, clause 2, says:

2. No person shall be removed from a competitive position except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the public service, and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice and be furnished a copy thereof, and be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal. Copy of such reasons, notice, and answer, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for any change in rank or compensation, and the Commission shall upon request be furnished with copies or the originals thereof.

The reason is plain why these expice are required to be filed. It

The reason is plain why these copies are required to be filed. is in order that the head of an Executive Department or one of the bureau chiefs can not corruptly or unlawfully under any pre-tense put in practice the old spoils system. The record must be there to justify the removal. Now, the President of the United States has interpreted that clause. President Roosevelt says:

Whereas said misunderstandings have existed, etc. Now, for the purpose of preventing all such misunderstandings and improper constructions of said section, it is hereby declared that the term "just cause," as used in section 8 of civil-service rule 2, is intended to mean any cause, other than one merely political or religious, which will promote the efficiency of the service; and nothing contained in said rule shall be construed to require the examination of witnesses or any trial or hearing, except in the discretion of the officer making the removal.

That gives that discretion to the bureau chief which he ought to have, and no honest man in the enforcement of that law can He ought not to be allowed upon the mere request ask for more. ask for more. He ought not to be allowed upon the mere request of a Member of Congress to put out a faithful employee. The administration of the law to-day is not perfect, but as the Commission say, the law itself is a long step toward the doing away forever with the serious evils depicted by Grant, Garfield, Calhoun, Webster, and the other statesmen who during their great careers saw and denounced the spoils system in politics. [Applayee]

plause.]
Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, if the advocates of this system of purveying the public patronage of the United States Government would treat gentlemen who are opposed to the present administration of the system with decent respect and give to their judgment the meed of being at least patriotic, we could dis-cuss these questions in a better spirit than that manifested by the gentleman who has just taken his seat. To call the critics of the present administration of the civil-service law "spoilsmen" is an offensive and opprobrious epithet, unfair and unjust. I have just as good a right in my representative capacity to point out the defects of this system and ask for their improvement, as the gentleman has to go back ten years prior to the enactment of this law and read the rainbow encomiums of theorists upon a condition that has never been. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Wisconsin believes that he is better than we are.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman—
The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the

gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. During the whole of my remarks
I abstained absolutely from using the word "spoilsmen." I spoke

of the spoils system.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman will find the statement in the notes, where he said that such an appointment was made upon the recommendation of spoilsmen. That was the language.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have not used those words in

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have not used those words in any statement I have made.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think the gentleman will find it there. I am glad to hear him say that he does not condemn everybody as a pirate who does not sail on the same ship that he does.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am assured by the gentleman who sits in front of me [Mr. Pearre] that I did not use that expression. He says that I used the word "politicians."

Mr. GROSVENOR. And the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Heprum] who sits near me assures me that the gentleman used the

Mr. GROSVENOR. And the gentleman from fowa [Mr. HEP-BURN], who sits near me, assures me that the gentleman used the word "spoilsmen." [Laughter.] Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I did not. Mr. GROSVENOR. Then we are all right on that branch of it. Now, let us see what happened in the matter of this system. The gentleman from Wisconsin has not been here during the entire career of this pure-in-heart system, this angelic system, that

tire career of this pure-in-heart system, this angelic system, that is just now being tested pretty fully in this Government.

A bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States by a Senator from Ohio, a Democrat, a man of high character, a man who would not debauch the public service any more than Mr. Garfield would. He introduced the bill and confessed openly—I refer to the Congressional Record—that he did it in order to wrest some of the offices from the hands of the Republican party

wrest some of the offices from the hands of the Republican party and put some few Democrats into office.

Mr. Hoar, of Massachusetts, in speaking of the bill, stated that he was in doubt about the propriety of the act, but he thought it might be a good plan to try the experiment. I do not use his exact language, but he said it was a tentative measure which could undoubtedly be made beneficial by amendment and perfection afterwards. That was twenty years ago. It was a new system, a novel system, a system that I am willing to say was suggested by some of the reasons given by General Garfield. gested by some of the reasons given by General Garfield.

I do not deny that there was room for reform, a necessity for reform, and I will try to point out, if my time can be extended, how anxiously men upon this floor have sought to present their views of what would be a reformatory process, but they have always been denied. That tentative measure stands on the statute books to-day without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t"." From the case that came from the Senata and was passed in the 't" from the one that came from the Senate and was passed in the House twenty years ago. It was a new system absolutely, a complete revolution of the old system, and yet it stands there as the perfection of wisdom. To-day a man might just as well attempt to reform the Ten Commandments as to attempt to change a word in that law. If you were to rise here and move to strike out a word from the Ten Commandments or from Christ's Sermon on the Mount, you would not be denounced any more bitterly than you would if you dared to say that this was not the perfection of human wisdom in any respect. It stands par excellence with the Declaration of Independence and the great enactments to which I have referred.

Mr. CLARK. Inasmuch as anybody who suggests a change in

this system gets skinned anyway to the utmost limit, as the gentleman says, why does not somebody get a bill reported here repealing the whole thing, and then let us have fair and square debate on it? And we can not be skinned any worse anyhow.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will show the gentleman why you can

not directly

Mr. CLARK. I would like to know now, because that has been bothering my mind ever since I have been here.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I commend to the genius of the able gentleman from Missouri that he can immortalize himself if by any possibility he can get a bill before this House to amend, to alter, to enlarge, or in any other wise affect that old law—that perfection of human wisdom to which I have referred.

Mr. CLARK. Well, the gentleman is on the Committee on Rules, and I would ask him why he does not report such a bill?

Rules, and I would a [Prolonged laughter.]

[Prolonged laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. For twenty years bill after bill has been introduced in this House. I am told something like five hundred bills are throw the number. Ever in all have been introduced. I do not know the number. Ever since I have been a Member of this House all kinds of bills have been introduced; bills to repeal the law; bills to enlarge the provisions of the law and make them more stringent; bills to confer the power upon this board that they have usurped from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has

expired.
Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous

consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Bills of every possible form suggesting amendments, and even bills to enlarge the power, the prerogative of the soldier in holding office, have been introduced into this House, and now I state here that there has never been a bill reported back from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service upon which there could have been engrafted an amendment affecting this law, either for its repeal or its improvement. So the Committee on Rules has no power to act, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Clark] fires a blank cartridge when he fires at me Missouri [Mr. CLARK] fires a blank cartridge when he fires at me on that subject. Why have they sat upon that safety valve? Why has it been that for twenty years this committee has sat persistently on the safety valve and prevented a bill from coming in here? Because everybody knows, that knows anything about Congress, that by a majority of three to one, probably four to one, this Civil Service Commission would be stripped of a vast percentage of its power, and the experience of twenty years would be injected into this law, and a system—not a "spoils" system, but a system of intelligent administration of the department of this Government would be the result. But the same cry is this Government would be the result. But the same cry is heard—denounce everybody as "spoilsmen," call them "corruptionists," lay at their door every irregularity that happens in the administration of the Government, and cry out against the right of the House to be heard.

In the Fifty-sixth Congress a meeting was held by 100 Members of this House, a round hundred Members on the Republican side of this House, and a bill setting forth our views upon can side of this House, and a bill setting forth our views upon the subject of civil service was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, now a judge of the United States courts. That bill was swallowed up in the vortex that has swallowed up all the attempted legislation for twenty years. That bill was not a bill for the benefit of the "spoilsmen." It was a bill fixing a tenure of office, providing for an examination of every applicant in the particular Department to which he sought admission, a competitive examination if it was desired, and then an appointment, first, as a temporary appointment, and afterwards as a permanent appointment for four years. That bill was not allowed to get into this House, for if it had come into this House it would have been passed by more than a two-thirds majority. You may say that there might be a possibility of these pressures from that committee by force of a more of these pressures from that committee by force of a more of these pressures from that committee by force of a more description. ing one of these measures from that committee by force of a mo-Whether that could be done or not I do not know. We have never yet, since I have been a Member of this House, resorted

Now, it is suggested that the men who are indicted are the result of the "spoils" system. There is a young gentleman languishing over here in the jail on the Eastern Branch who, it is said, passed a civil-service examination in this city and stood the highest—far the highest of those examined—and he is now in jail awaiting his trial for embezzlement; and it has been discovered that prior to his great achievement before the Civil Service Commission he had served a term either in a reformatory or a penitentiary for forgery.

But I do not care for that. There is no system of appointment

men; that is impossible. So the fact that one or more men now indicted or whoever else was appointed or not appointed under the civil-service law is not material. It is enough for me to know that the system itself is holding in office and preventing the removal from office of the men who are now charged with these crimes.

Why, sir, I remember when a gentleman came here from Kentucky—brought here by Mr. Carlisle—and it was not very long after he arrived until upward of 3,000 employees of the Departments were turned out because they were Republicans. That was in 1885, before the gentleman from Wisconsin understood what was going on here. And when they had cleared the decks and turned out three or four thousand officeholders, then this same gentleman draw an order of the President covering too. same gentleman drew an order of the President covering permanently and forever every one of those employees who had taken the place of the Republicans turned out; and that order has held them in office from that day to this. To-day they are still hold-

ing office.

More than one-fourth of the clerks in the Departments here in Washington to-day were brought here under circumstances of practically a similar character and were blanketed into office under the "merit" system and branded "merit," while the men who went out were branded "spoilsmen:" and this gentleman continued to purvey the patronage of this Government from that day world very recently.

day until very recently.

We all understand that. The history of those times is not unfamiliar to us. And during that time effort after effort was made to amend this statute, utterly without effect. If these gentlemen will bring into this House any bill upon which an amendment will be germane to affect the conditions of this law, I will see to it that no tacking of such an amendment as this is attempted upon

that no tacking of such an amendment as this is attempted upon an appropriation bill.

But there is no reason why the Representatives of the people of this country may not have an opportunity to be heard upon their view of this question. We are just as much interested in the purity of this Government as is the Civil Service Commission itself—appointed under a system that to me smacks very strongly of the "spoils" system. I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, What is the difference between a Representative of the people recommending a worthy young man of his district for appointment as a clerk or a messenger in one of the Departments and the President of the United States selecting a collector, or Civil Service Commissioner, or somebody else to be a purveyor of all these of-

Commissioner, or somebody else to be a purveyor of all these offices? One is the "spoils" system, if you please, upon a mighty small margin; the other has now become a "spoils" system that requires nearly \$30,000,000 to pay the salaries for a single year.

When this law went into effect the expenditures under this bill now pending here amounted to about \$20,000,000. To-day it amounts to nearly \$30,000,000, and we are told that the reason for that is that 16 per cent of this amount—that is the estimate given to me vesterday—is paid to men absolutely worthless for that is that 16 per cent of this amount—that is the estimate given to me yesterday—is paid to men absolutely worthless to the public service, absolutely worthless. So that we have practically a civil pension. And the advocates of this civil-service system are already advocating such a pension. Whenever one of these great civil-service reform conventions meets, somebody during its progress will make a speech declaring that we must have a civil-pension list. You know, gentlemen, and I know that is what is coming. We have it by indirection now to the extent of 30 per cent added to the cost of running the Government in this city alone, and we shall have it as long as this system lasts.

of per cent added to the cost of running the Government in this city alone, and we shall have it as long as this system lasts.

It is not worth while to tell me that men can be turned out of office here without any trial and without any suggestion. The law that says to the people of the United States that A shall not be turned out of office except for cause—such a provision, taken in connection with a system that permits somebody to send the man out without any explanation, without any trial, without any hearing, is an outrage against the common judgment of mankind in the matter of decent administration of power. Far better would it be if they would stand by the original proposition that McKin-ley made—that a man should not be turned out of office without charges preferred against him and without having the opportunity to be heard.

The gentleman reads with a great deal of satisfaction an order from the President saying that the heads of these Departments, under a law that says the officeholders shall not be turned out except for cause, may say to such, "Take your traps and go." Then the public understands that he has been turned out for cause, and he has no opportunity to know what the cause is.

cause, and he has no opportunity to know what the cause is.

When did it happen that the destinies of this country were assailed by the lack of virtue in the representatives of the people? Are Congressmen so utterly unfit for the high duty of citizenship that they are not permitted even to suggest that in their town or in their county there lives John Smith, who has a good horse and a good wagon, and is a bright, intelligent young man, who knows all the roads on the route of the rural free delivery, and that it would be a good idea to give him applyment for the hepefit of But I do not care for that. There is no system of appointment | would be a good idea to give him employment for the benefit of that will preserve the public service from debauchery by bad his family and himself? Are we so corrupt that we dare not go

to this inspector when he comes around and even say to him, "There is a good fellow and capable man?" If you do it you violate the law, and if you do it I defy you to get an appointment made that you have thus O. K.'d. It has gone on step by step until an oligarchy is formed, nominally of three men, up to a very recent date consisting of one man, that simply makes the

very recent date consisting of one man, that simply makes the terms and conditions upon which men may be appointed to office. Only a short time ago it was permissible, under this rural free-delivery carrier system, that the inspector might put into the paper that had the answers that were sent to the Civil Service Commission here an expression of opinion as to the intelligence, good looks, and cleanly habits of the applicant. That is now cut off. Why? So that there may be no man living who shall dictate anything connected with the office, or suggest anything, except this board of men here in the capital of the country. You have no capacity, you do not know when a man is fit to carry the have no capacity, you do not know when a man is fit to carry the mail 25 miles every day. You can not tell that. You are not capable of it, but there is a board sitting here who can detail a chief, and he can take a written examination and tell all about the man.

It is enough to say that the expenditures under this system have increased 30 per cent. It is enough to say that under this system the wrongs and outrages and irregularities and crimes that are charged to-day, if they did not originate under the civil-service administration, have been covered through the administration of that system up to date. [Applause.]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the civil-service law has come and come to stay. These attacks and attempts to recent

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the civil-service law has come, and come to stay. These attacks and attempts to repeal the law by cutting off supplies have been grimly characterized by one of the Civil Service Commission as "the annual joke of the House;" but, nevertheless, there ought to be some remedy. When an attempt is made to rectify, to modify, to modernize, and improve this law, those who make the effort are called "spoilsmen," and the law is spoken of as the "merit system." In other words, this one law is looked upon as specially sanctified, and one which can not and should not be improved. On the other hand, it is assailed as being a law that interferes with appoint hand, it is assailed as being a law that interferes with appointhand, it is assailed as being a law that interferes with appointment to office through the representatives of the people, and one that ought to be swept away. The greatest defect of the present system is the difficulty in getting rid of the inefficient.

Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress I prepared a bill upon the theory that there ought to be every five years, or at some other stated period, a reexamination, and that the Departments should

then have an opportunity to drop anyone they wanted to, with or without cause, making each employee eligible to reappointment by being examined in the line of the work that he was performing. Under this method each clerk would look forward to his

stated turn of reexamination and reappointment.

Having introduced this bill, my mail was flooded with anonymous letters, with appeals from various persons, who seemed to feel that it was an attack upon some of their privileges, and that an examination of this kind would deprive them of office; and from the number of missives of that kind that came in my mail I from the number of missives of that kind that came in my mail I became convinced that there were many who would undoubtedly be dropped at such periods. In case such a bill as that was passed, there would be no temptation upon the part of the officials in power to drop employees simply because of a wish to appoint somebody else, because those to be appointed must come through the civil-service channels, and they would not know who they would get to fill the vacant places, thus preventing dropping of names, except for the good of the service, and at the same time putting all the employees upon their merit and subject to frequent examinations. This would be an evolution from the present existent and would improve the service without any return to quent examinations. This would be an evolution from the present system, and would improve the service without any return to

the old method, which was so severely condemned in its day.

The best civil service we have to-day in the Government of the United States is the Railway Mail Service. The postal clerks are examined repeatedly. They have to stand examinations very often, and the result has been that the service has been improved from the state of the service has been improved the s from time to time, and is constantly improving. The same method applied to the other branches of the Government, coupled with periodical times when the Government could relieve itself of the

periodical times when the Government could relieve itself of the inefficients, would bring this system up to a real merit system. It is not repeal, but improvement in existing law that is needed. It is not a true "merit system" that we have now.

The service in general, Mr. Chairman, is good. There is no doubt about that. But it could be improved, and the fact that it is good has caused the officials in the Departments to tolerate its many faults for fear that in attempting to improve it they might get something worse. If we could have the aid of the Civil Service Commission along these lines it would be much better. But that Commission has usually assumed that whenever an But that Commission has usually assumed that whenever an amendment of the law was proposed it was evidence of hostility upon the part of the Congress

The Commission should aid the Congress by the suggestion of

amendments needed to improve the service.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I desire a few moments to express certain views upon a subject that has already been before the committee. I heard with much pleasure the remarks just made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], and I only regret that he did not go somewhat further in the views that he expressed on the subject of giving every man a fair trial and an honest hearing before impartial jurors of his country before he is condemned and pronounced guilty by anyone. I have been taught, Mr. Chairman, by the profession that I have followed and honor—like all other lawyers on this floor have been taught—that prejudice is like the breath of a human being upon a pure, unblurred pane of glass on a frosty morning; and, I think, of all men in this great Republic of ours that the high officers of our Government should see to it that in the administration of our laws the humblest as well as the highest citizen should have a fair, impartial, and unbiased trial before his peers—an unprejudiced jury. No influence or expression should come from one in authority calculated to do prejudice or harm to a citizen on trial for an alleged offense.

harm to a citizen on trial for an alleged offense.

I have, Mr. Chairman, no apologies to make and no explanations to give as to any of the men who are alleged to have been guilty of the post-office frauds. They are each and every one entitled to a full and fair hearing before conviction. If guilty, then punish them; if innocent, free them. I was glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Bartlett] say that they were entitled to a fair trial and ought to have it. Every man would agree with him. What I desire to call the attention of the committee specially to is a matter that which I do not think the American Congress ought to pass silently by without a protest. We ought not, Mr. Chairman, to allow a precedent to be made and passed in this country without an honest, impartial, dispassionate, nonpolitical protest which tends to obstruct and hinder a fair and just administration of the law. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the "Memorandum of the President" of the United States and attached to Mr. Bristow's report. I dare say that no such memorandum from one so high in authority can be found and will ever occur again in the history of this great Refound and will ever occur again in the history of this great Republic of ours against citizens under indictment, charged with grave crimes, as that which I now read. It is this:

Memorandum upon the various papers submitted from the Department of Justice and the Post-Office Department concerning the investigation into the corrupt practices obtaining in the Post-Office Department, notably in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General and in the office of the Assistant Attorney-General for that Department. All the documents in the case are herewith forwarded to the Post-Office Department, and will be held ready for submission to the Congress whenever it may choose to ask for them.

The President of the United States ought to have simply re-The President of the United States ought to have simply returned the papers to the proper Department without comment, and there stopped. Certainly there can be no difference among us as to that opinion. He occupies the greatest office in the world to-day. Whenever the occupant of that office pronounces an opinion for or against a man it has a powerful weight and an influence that no man wants to confront on his trial. It matters not how guilty the parties may be, it was not becoming in the President of the United States to pronounce them guilty before trial. What does the President say about these men that were then under indictment—were awaiting a trial? It was indeed an extraordinary indiscretion and thoughtlessness, and a precedent that the conservative, law-abiding people of this country will not

I say distinctly that I am not here as the apologist for Machen or Tyner or anyone else charged with frauds in the Post-Office Department, but I am here, as you are, to see that the precedents of our country, made by the President of the United States, should conform to the law and not be unfair to any citizen. What

does he say?

The investigation made by Mr. Bristow discloses a condition of gross corruption in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General and in that of the Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that declaration by the President is a solemn declaration that these parties are guilty—guilty before a jury of their countrymen has pronounced them so.

Did you read the appeal that General Tyner made? I never saw him. I do not know him. I could not tell you to-day in what State he lives. But his appeal for a fair trial and justice against the denunciation of the President of the United States was one the denunciation of the President of the United States was one of the most powerful and pathetic appeals that I have ever read. He said that for forty-one years and more he had served his country in official positions without a blot or a stain on his character, and the struggle with him to-day is whether paralysis, which has afflicted his body, will carry him to the grave before he can have the opportunity he desires to establish and vindicate his honor and his integrity against the denunciation so publicly and recklessly made against him by the President of the United States. What a spectacle is here presented to the American people—an old man 78 years old praying that his life may be spared long enough to defend his name and transmit it untarnished to his family.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more

minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks that his time may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I say, Mr. Chairman, we ought to be careful and never even as private citizens pronounce our fellow-man guilty of crime until so declared by a jury. The President was too strenuous, and so it is through this whole report, when he truly pronounces all of these men guilty. I say to you as lawyers, and many of you are, that we have been schooled and tanght from our early manhood as lawyers to look upon this to you as lawyers, and many or you are, that we have been schooled and taught from our early manhood as lawyers to look upon this as a government of law; that the law applies to and governs the President of the United States as it does to the humblest citizen of this great Republic. And when a position of that kind is taken, I do not care who it comes from, it ought not to be passed silently by this House without some protest. I admit that a Democrat on this side of the House is more likely to enter that protest than a Republicant on the other side not because there are not many Re-Republican on the other side, not because there are not many Republicans who are with me in the views here expressed, but we are all but human.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not here to discuss the civil-service allowance or appropriations. Heave that duty to other gentlemen. For myself I am perfectly willing to sustain any theory of any government that makes officers or offices more honest and honor-

able in our Government.

But one thing more about what the President has said in his "memorandum." "In all that is said," says the President, "by the report of Mr. Bristow I cordially concur." Mr. Bristow unconditionally pronounced these men guilty. Now, I am always for fair play. I believe a man ought to have a fair trial; absolutely fair. If there is anything in the world that I hate and despise it is a prejudice that gether sayond a court house when the spise it is a prejudice that gathers around a court-house when the whole people are aroused in their prejudices and passion, and it is then that the lawyer and the law should stand firmest and strongest. With this excitement that arises sometimes about public offices, how easy it is to appeal to popular prejudice and popular passion and ingratiate ourselves for political preferment by being active and strenuous, it would seem, in the denunciation of criminals. Ah, whenever that is resorted to by high officials of our Government in any way it is woe to our Republic and to just, fair, and unbiased trials before a jury. It is that that I pro-pose to protest against, and nothing more than that, Mr. Chairnose to protest against, and nothing more than that, Mr. Chairman, and I hope I do so in an absolutely polite and courteous and respectful manner. I do not think that this unauthorized and unjust act on the part of the President should be allowed to pass without such a protest being made. [Applause.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, it is with no little embarrassment and some hesitancy that I undertake to say a word or two in favor of the Civil Service Commission and the civil-service law.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments that I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments that have been made by the eminent gentlemen on both sides of this House, and I confess that I am surprised and impressed greatly with the unanimity with which the leaders on both sides of the House concur in opposition to the civil-service law. I will admit that their ability, that their long experience here entitles their testimony to a great deal of weight and consideration, but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I am so thoroughly imbued with the idea of the righteousness of civil service and the Civil Service Commission that I am impelled to raise my voice, weak though it may be, in defense of that law

in defense of that law.

To my mind it is not an argument against the Civil Service Commission and the civil-service law that there are those who are holding offices by virtue of that law who are dishonest or corrupt. I do not believe it is a good argument against the civil service that men who have been appointed under its provisions have been found dishonest and wanting and derelict in public duty. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe because it is an expensive piece of Chairman, I do not believe because it is an expensive piece or machinery that that alone should be sufficient why we should refuse to appropriate money under this bill for the continuance of the Commission in office. We have upon all the statute books, I presume, in our States a law against murder, and yet every day we hear and know of men who maliciously and unlawfully take human life. Will we, because the law is violated, clean our statutes of everything that may make murder a crime?

It has been charged eloquently by the gentleman from Georgia

It has been charged eloquently by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Bartlett] that the law has not been properly administered; that there have been acts done and performed by those in authority which are contrary to law and against good government and honest government. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that is a valid objection to the law itself. I do not believe that that should the considered expent in so for as we might want to remark the be considered, except in so far as we might want to remedy the evils—if there are evils, and I believe there are—that exist. I am in favor of civil-service law, because it takes from partisan politics, and from all the evils that come from that, the appointments

to office. I believe that is the theory, and I am in favor of it for that reason, because it takes away a great many reasons why in-efficient and incompetent men could get into office if it were not for that law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I ask that the time of the

gentleman be extended for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks that the time of the gentleman from Nebraska be extended for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none

Mr. NORRIS. I am in favor of the law not only for the good Mr. NORMS. I am in layor of the law not only for the good it does directly, but for the evil it prevents indirectly. Why, sir, you repeal this law and you put on the bargain counter of partisan politics the appointment of all the officers under the Government. In the limited time I have at my disposal I can not go into the question, though I should like to do so; but I want to say if these evils exist in the law it strikes me that the thing we should

these evils exist in the law it strikes me that the thing we should do is to remedy the defects by amending the law. If there are those who are administering the law and are not doing it according to law, let us not repeal the law on that account, but compel those who are holding their positions to do their duty the same as we do in any other law. Let us consider it in a businesslike manner, upon a patriotic and open basis, above the range of all partisanship and politics of every kind.

[Applause.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman. I desire the repeal of the civilservice law for the protection, among other things, of the morals of Members of Congress. [Laughter.] I want to protect those gentlemen who at home are in favor of the repeal of this law and here are civil-service zealots; the fellows who are at home saying, "Ah, Bill, I would like to get you a place, and I would do it if it was not for this civil-service law." [Laughter.] Here they are purists.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if there is not the same measure of corruption in a Member of Congress going to-day to the head of a Department and asking for the retention of one of those old and decrepid men who are utterly incapable of renderthose old and decrepte men who are utterly incapable of Fendering a day's service to the Government in a year. I am advised that before one of the great committees of this House officers of the Government said that they could not get rid of the deadwood in their offices because of the importunities of Members of Congress. I wonder if they are civil-service reformers. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I want again to resent this idea that because I

want the repeal of this law I am a spoilsman. I have never advocated or recommended the appointment of any man to office who was not, in my judgment, a worthy man. I do not do as the gentleman, if he is correct in his reading, who makes one of the eminent men of this country say that he did—urge the appointment of improper and impure men because of their persistent solicitation. And right here let me say that I am sorry that the gentleman from Wisconsin failed to make an argument himself in favor of this system. He contented himself with reading from the speeches of men who spoke six years before this system had its birth; who spoke of another and ideal system, possibly, for something in which there might be merit, and something that might entitle itself to his approval. He read from a report of a

might entitle itself to his approval. He read from a report of a Senate committee, made a year before the enactment of this law, and made when they had nothing to discuss except the English system, one entirely different from our own.

Now, what were they—the English Parliament—trying to remedy? In the business of forty years ago, when this question was rife in the English Parliament, the evil complained of was that the younger sons of the nobility filled all of the civil offices, and that because of their station because of their rapk, and he and that because of their station, because of their rank, and because of their power they were above the control of those who were charged with seeing to the proper conduct of the service. And they would neither work or permit others to do it, and it was to relieve that evil that the movement in favor of civil serv-

ice began.

It was from examples of that kind and from literature of that kind that the gentlemen thirty years ago drew their imaginative pictures

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has

expired.
Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may be permitted to conclude his re-

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The

Chair hears none.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, in what I say here in this discussion, I desire to make no animadversion upon the gentlemen who are charged with the conduct of this business—the Civil Service Commission. I have no doubt they are gentlemen of integrity,

fully impressed with the value of the work they are engaged in, and doing the very best they can. I want to say further that I am not opposed to a proper civil service. I am opposed to that we have, because it is a fraud and a humbug, and because it does not do what it pretends to do. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Iowa

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me for a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Surely.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did the gentleman from Iowa at the last session introduce a bill to amend this law?

Mr. HEPBURN. I did not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did he ever introduce such a bill?

Mr. HEPBURN. I have not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Why did he not do it?

Mr. HEPBURN. Because there were bills pending that met my views, that were pending before the committee, and more

Mr. HEPBURN. Because there were bills pending that met my views, that were pending before the committee, and upon which we could not get reports. Simply because I knew that under the organization of that committee it would be impossible, under the rules of this House, to secure action, and the gentleman from Wisconsin knows it. Why does he ask me that question? He knows the fact. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow me to answer the question?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman and white to answer the question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman know that the rules were adopted at the opening of this session, upon the express statement of members of the Committee on Rules, that we kill which the majority of the Horse provided to the that any bill which the majority of the House wanted to get be-fore the House could be got before it, regardless of the rules? The gentieman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dalzell], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dalzell], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Payne], and others have so declared, and the House by a majority sustained that action. If the gentleman wanted, he could have introduced a bill and got it before the House of his own volition.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, do you believe that is true? [Laughter.] Why does the gentleman make that kind of an argument? It is like his argument on this heatened reforms and reshores are trans-

like his argument on this bastard reform, and perhaps not any

more sincere. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have said that I was in favor of civil service, and I am. If I could introduce a bill that would go before the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and if I could compel the gentlemen to report it to the House, I would not care in what shape they might return it. The bill that I would introduce would have the following features: "That all clerks and other civil employees of the Government pays selected through the sid would have the following features: "That all clerks and other civil employees of the Government now selected through the aid of the Civil Service Commission shall hereafter be appointed by the head of the Department in which they are to serve; that such appointment shall be after the applicant has, through a careful examination, shown his fitness to discharge efficiently the duties of the position for which he applies, and shall be for the period of six months; that at the expiration of said term, if such appoints six months; that at the expiration of said term, if such appointee six months; that at the expiration of said term, it such appointee shows fitness, diligence, industry, intelligence, integrity, and the other necessary qualifications, he shall be appointed for a period of seven years, but shall at any time be subject to dismissal for causes other than political by the head of the Department, who shall be the sole judge of the sufficiency of the cause of dismissal and who shall certify in his letter of dismissal that the removal is not for religible traces that such such such shall be clirible. is not for political reasons; that such employee shall be eligible to reappointment.'

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that that would be a civil service that would have value. I have heard gentlemen inveigh against the difficulties that they would be subjected to through the importunities of men who might want office. I would like to know from some such gentlemen who these men are that they now fear would disturb the equilibrium of their nerves because of their imwould disturb the equilibrium of their nerves because of their importunity for office. Are they the chairmen of your committees? Are they the men who are at the polls on election day? Are they the men that are your friends through the thick and thin of a political campaign? Are they the men to whom, morally at least, you owe something because of the position that you now occupy, while you are turning your backs on them? You speak for the integrity of Members of Congress. I speak for the integrity of Members of Congress who make pledges during the campaign and are deaf to them here in the House

and are deaf to them here in the House.

and are dear to them here in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is corruption in the appointment of political friends to office. I believe that when the Republican party is in power every officer that can influence in any degree the efficiency of that Administration ought to be Republican. [Applause.] I believe that when the Democratic party is in power it should have the aid of its friends in all of the positions that may influence the efficiency, the respectability of the party [applause], and I think that the man who comes to Congress through a political contest is a dastard when he goes back on these implied obligations. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I say all of this, and yet I am not a "spoilsman."

That man is a spoilsman who will use his power for the purpose

of placing in office an improper and inefficient man, a dishonest man, and he may do that as a commissioner of the civil service just as well as he may through his influence as a Member of Congress. What does the Civil Service Commission know of the fitness of men for office that they from time to time certify in response to requisitions? All they can know is that measure of information that comes to them through the reports that are made from time to time by these commissions over the country. Gentlemen say that they want to maintain this system because Memtlemen say that they want to maintain this system because Members of Congress can not be trusted.

Can these gentlemen, of whom you know nothing, who constitute these commissions all over the country, be trusted? I would rather risk the man who has something at stake; I would rather rather risk the man who has something at stake; I would rather risk the man that has achieved distinction, that has done something, that has secured the approval of his people, than the man utterly unknown to me; and I would rather trust my brother Members here with this great responsibility, if you choose to call it such, than those that are utterly unknown. Still, suppose that you are to adopt the plan I suggest, it does not necessarily follow that the duty of selection or of aiding in selection would fall upon Members of Congress. Probably they would assist, but what one of you would dare to select a scalawag from among his neighbors who know him and put him here in an official position? Your people at home would have something to say about that. If you selected an unworthy man, if you gave him the benefit of If you selected an unworthy man, if you gave him the benefit of your indorsement, you would hear from that in the next caucus

or in the next election. I am not afraid of results of that kind, nor am I afraid of the great importunities for office. I undertake to say there is more of that now than there was when I first became a Member of this House. There is the same measure of importunity, but the difference is this-then you could aid in the selection of proper men,

why, Mr. Chairman, there is a wonderful difference between now and then. Here in my hand is the second report made by the Civil Service Commission. It covers 14,000 people, To-day under the civil service there are 125,000 officers of the United Can anybody suggest any advance in the direction of

good that has resulted?

What man claims that the service of the United States in the clerical departments, in the city of Washington, for example, is better to-day than it was twenty-two years ago? No man dares to say it. It is not the truth; and the older men who have been here and are familiar with both periods will tell you so. Look at the expenditure. See how the expense has increased. See how the number of clerks has multiplied. See how, with all that multiplication, the condition of the public business requires that there should be one-half hour additional time added to the hours of labor heretofore given. That means something. What does of labor heretofore given. That means something. What does it mean? It means that in all this increase of numbers the busi-What does ness is lagging; the business is behind; and this half hour must be added to the other thirteen half hours that the clerks work. Is this because there has been such a wonderful growth in the aggregate of business, or is it because there is not as much labor per capita performed by each one of the clerks now as of old? What is probable?

What better spur is there to diligence and zeal and industry than the fear that a hagrative position may be lost? Why are

than the fear that a lucrative position may be lost? you gentlemen diligent in the performance of your duty, solicitous about the will of your constituents, more than are others that I might name? The reason is, because each two years you must render an account of your stewardship. Every two years your constituents have the power to deny you a further lease of political power if your conduct has not suited them. You are diligent. So will the man be who sees before him every day of diligent. So will the man be who sees before him every day or his life the possible termination of his relation to his office, rather than the man who knows that through these civil-service intrica-cies he is so hedged about that his removal is practically an im-

possibility.

possibility.

I remember once a prominent officer of this Government in this city telling me that in the Bureau of the Sixth Auditor he had 470 clerks. "Fifty of them," he said, "can not reach their desks when the elevator is out of repair; and if I could be permitted to make selections I would undertake to perform all the duties of that great Bureau with 200 clerks."

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow

me a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir. Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Why could he not make such a selection under the present law?

Mr. HEPBURN. You know why as well as I.
Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I know that he could.
Mr. HEPBURN. I undertake to say that it would be an utter impossibility for him to do it.
Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. May I ask why?
Mr. HEPBURN. Simply because he has not the power; simply

because, while the law may give it to him, the gentleman knows that practically it can not be done. The gentleman knows that through the union of clerks they sustain one another, and that under the system as we have it now charges, unless of the grossest character, can not be sustained.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. Lacey] has said that this motion is the joke of the season. He is right. The fact is, he is nearly always right. It is only by a mistake when he fails to be

right. [Laughter.]
Mr. LACEY. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said that the Civil Service Commissioners had characterized this as a

the Civil Service Commissioners had characterized this as a "joke." I was quoting from them.

Mr. HEPBURN. I thought I had better put the remark on the gentleman than on the Commission. I did not think that any commission created by this House would have the impudence to so characterize the deliberate action of this House, especially when it bore upon themselves, and while I did hear my friend say that the Commission so said, I thought possibly he was mistaken and that it was better that I should put it upon him than to charge the indecency upon the Commission. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I know that in a sense this is a joke. I know that probably no direct result will come in keeping from these worthy Commissioners their pay. We will pay them. But there

worthy Commissioners their pay. We will pay them. But there is this in it: This is the only opportunity that we have to express ourselves upon this proposition. And I think that it will result in the creation of such a sentiment as may penetrate even as far as Massachusetts, and may have some influence upon those puriets of Boston who trammel us in this way, and who are standing. ists of Boston who trammel us in this way, and who are standing, as I think, in the way of progress and in the way of good governent. [Applause.] Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am some-

what encouraged by the debate this morning. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hepburn] say that he believes in a proper civil service. That, I believe, was his limitation. I always thought the gentleman could not really prefer the other alternative.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me a moment?
Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Why, of course.
Mr. HEPBURN. Simply to suggest to you that in two preceding Congresses I submitted substantially the same views.
Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. If the gentlemen did, they

were so beclouded by other remarks that the other sentiment re-

mained in my mind, and not that.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Grosvenor] began his remarks by saying he hoped this matter would be discussed in a temperate manner. If I recollect in the past, in the little circle where he sits, the temperature has been rather high when this subject has been up; but I will acknowledge that to my surprise the gentleman from Ohio heeded his own admonition, and I shall try to do the same. I think the matter ought to be discussed temperately. I was quite edified yesterday to hear those two veterans of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Iowa, both of whom we all so much admire, exchanging regrets with each other because they originally voted for this law, and looking back apparently with fond regrets to the old halcyon days when there was no civil service.

I could but think how happy it would be for them if there was none to-day. With their long service and ability and influence, what is there in the way of offices which they could not to-day expect? There is no doubt about it, the passage of that law took the bread out of our mouths. I do not profess to have any less fondness for bread than anyone else, and naturally Members of Congress can not help feeling some personal regret, perhaps, that we no longer have that patronage which they had in the days the gentleman spoke of. I confess I thought possibly their opinions were tempered a little by that peculiarity of human nature which is said always to make us, as we grow older, look back upon the days of our youth as the harvydays and the week to be a second of the contract of the second of the contract of the second of the contract days of our youth as the happy days and the present as degenerate. I really think if the gentlemen's sober judgment could impartially be applied to it, they would admit that the civil service to-day is

vastly better than it was before this law.

For myself, I long ago came to the conclusion that there was one principle which I believed in and which I should stand by, no matter what others did, and that was the principle that the merit system is better than the old patronage system. I believe that the people generally have come to believe that. I believe that the people generally would rather trust almost any impartial test to decide what clerks shall be selected than to leave it to the Congressmen to appoint their friends. The men who want office, who are our personal friends, who, perhaps, may make more noise than others and directly influence us, may not feel so; but the sober, reflective, fireside opinion of the United States, in my judgment, believes in that system, and would bring defeat upon any party which should overthrow it. It was originally passed under the lash of public opinion and I think that opinion is now far more decided in its favor.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman know any Member of Congress who advocates the appointment of men to office upon the recommendation of Members?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The repeal of this law means

Mr. GROSVENOR. May not this law be repealed by the sub-

Mr. GROSVENOR. May not this law be repealed by the substitution of a better plan?

Mr. GHLLETT of Massachusetts. Possibly. I am very glad that the gentleman does not favor the repeal of this law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Ido not. I never did; but I am only wanting to get rid of a great central power in a free government that purveys the offices of the Government just exactly as an arbitrary power in an ancient serfdom does in that kind of a country.

Mr. GHLLETT of Massachusetts. I am glad the gentleman feels so, and I am very glad if the Members of this House generally want some sort of merit system. I for one do not pretend that the present service is perfect. The gentleman criticises the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service by saying that for the last twenty years it has never allowed any amendment to get into the House. But does the gentleman consider why that is? The reason why that committee has been the defender of the civil service, in my opinion, is because the Speakers of this House civil service, in my opinion, is because the Speakers of this House for at least twenty years, no matter to what party they belonged, and both parties have been in power, no matter what their individual opinions might be on this question of the civil service, but acting as great party leaders, as Speakers ought to act—for that is his greatest function—every Speaker has seen to it that that committee was framed to defend and not to overthrow the civil service law. It seems that the Speaker of the House with a sense of ice law. It seems that the Speaker of the House, with a sense of responsibility for his party, has always believed that it should not

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me an inquiry? I am not sure whether I understood him. Do I understand the gentleman to say that in order to maintain this law it has been necessary. sary for the Speakers of this House to pack the committee against

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Why, the Speaker of this House has, I imagine, in one sense, always packed his committees.

Mr. HEPBURN. Against his political friends?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Packed them with his friends

for a certain policy.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh! Then you mean to say, in other words, that this committee has been packed, and that it has been necessary in order to maintain this unwholesome law.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It is not necessary to use un-

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It is not necessary to use unpleasant verbs or adjectives, or to say that they packed it in an offensive sense, or for political advantage; but when the Speaker has made up the committee he always saw that it was friendly to the civil-service law. If you call that "packing" it, I think they have packed it. I do not think, however, that is a pleasant verb to apply to the Speakers' positions. I think they have done so for the best interests of the country and their party. If the gentleman considers that packing the committee, it has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I would like five minutes more

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

[After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Now, just a word as to the gentleman's claim that the old service is better than the new. This is the only place I think of where the old system is in force—this Capitol, in this House and at the other end of the Capitol. There is no civil service here. What is the result? Our present Speaker told us two or three Congresses ago that we had from a half to a third more employees than was necessary, and why? Simply because each Member insisted that he should have somebody on the force: not because it is needed, but because they want

body on the force: not because it is needed, but because they want
the patronage. Under this service the superintendent of an employee can not discharge him or properly control him, because a
criticism of him would not only apply to him, but to the Member
who had appointed him.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman leaves an impression that
there was no place where there was not civil service in any of the
Departments. I remind the gentleman of the Congressional Library and the District buildings. I would like you to compare
the Government

the Government.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Why, Mr. Chairman, the Library is not under the civil-service law. We all know, and the gentleman as well as anybody, that the Librarian acts upon the civilervice principles in refusing to recognize it as a patronage bureau.

If all the bureaus in all of the Departments were not protected by the civil service, we all know that the heads of Departments would be influenced by us and that we would be influenced by them.

If it were not for the fact that the civil-service system exists, if we should go to the Departments and ask an appointment and at the same time they wanted some legislation of us, does not that unfairly affect both them and us? Would not they, by appointing the man we wanted, put us in the position that when they wanted some resolution or law we would be influenced by them, and they would be influenced in their appointments by us?

I think, would be a great detriment to the public service, and preventing that is one of the great advantages of the present system.

I want to say now that at the first meeting of the committee this year the subject was taken up, and it was determined that we should have an investigation of the whole subject of superannuation, and I hope that the committee may report some bill.

I certainly think we will if we can agree upon it. I shall not be

one opposed to its coming before this House.

I am perfectly willing that it may come before this House. I do not believe that the House would now annihilate the service, although I very much fear that the House could not agree upon anything that would improve it, but, rather, that any legislation would be a detriment to it. But this amendment which is suggested now is not action that the House ought to take. The gentleman who makes the motion to strike out the appropriation allows that it does not accomplish anything. The members of the Commission can get their salaries, but I think it is a little unkind just as three new Commissioners are entering office to greet them with such action on the part of this House, which is simply a kick at the Commission and does not accomplish anything. I think the proper thing to do is, as the House can do if it really wishes, to bring up a resolution. I hope myself some proposition will come from the Committee eithers I make the properties will come from the Committee, although I make no pledges

The only point where I think amendment is needed is in the superannuation. The gentleman says the officers have not the power now to dismiss incompetent clerks. They have, in my opinion, ample power. Under the present law any officer can discharge any person, and he ought to do it if the clerk is incompetent, and the trouble is not in the law, but in the Department officers. Who the trouble is not in the law, but in the Department officers. Who they do not do it I do not know. I suspect there are three reasons—first, the natural sympathy they have for the old men, who probably tell them, and very likely truthfully, that they have nothing to live on, and they hate to put them out in the cold world and be responsible for it. I think another reason is that a great many are old soldiers, and that still further intensifies the unwillingness, and thirdly, there are cases where Members of this and the other House go and protest against their dismissal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I may ask that the gentleman may have further time if he so desires.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not care for further

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not care for further

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to state to the House that I feel that there has been a fair discussion upon this paragraph in the bill, and after the gentleman has the minutes he desires I shall ask the regular order, a vote on the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will yield about three minutes to me to put three questions to the chairman of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, the spoils system may be bad, but with respect to the Departments here in Washington I do not believe that any system can be much worse than the one now in We are told that there are some 27,000 employees in They soon become practically professional office-Washington is getting to be an educational center of ortance. There are great universities and colleges here, vast importance. vast importance. There are great universities and coneges here, and there are thousands of young men and women all over the country who would be glad of an opportunity to come here, hold a Government position for a while, and have the benefit of these institutions of learning, and I believe that the solution of this whole question is involved in an amendment to the present law providing for a term of office as to the employees who hold office in Washington. I know of no reason why a person who holds a clerical position here might not hold that position for a term of years as a Member of Congress does.

There are thousands of young men all over this country who would be proud of the opportunity to come here and hold one of these positions, say, for three or four or five years. The advantage of that, Mr. Chairman, would be that at the end of the term of office the person holding the position would then retire to the ranks of private life and be of service to his community; but while a person holds a position for life he generally soon becomes unfitted for any other position, and I believe the Government would get better service if the employee knew he would hold the place for a term of years only. We will soon be confronted

with the proposition to pension the officials who become incapacitated to work, and it seems to me that the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee could well devote his energies and utilize his large knowledge with respect to this question in the preparation of a bill carrying out the suggestions which I am

making.

I believe, with respect to the offices outside of the city of Washington, that the old policy is the best—that is, to put the entire responsibility upon the party in power. When the Republicans in power let them have the places and let them shoulder the entire responsibility of government. And when the Democrats come into power next year we will do likewise. A Member of Congress has to fight for his seat every two years. The position he holds is certainly as important as that of the employee in the various Departments here. What possible objection can there be to this change? Let the applicant stand an examination, as he does now, but let him understand that at the expiration of his term of office he must stand his chance for reappointment just as if he had never held a place under the Government.

Under the present system it is almost useless for a young man or woman to apply for a position here. All the places are filled, and filled for life almost. The only vacancies are those caused

by death.

I submit it is against the spirit of our institutions to confer ap-I submit it is against the spirit of our institutions to confer appointment and power for life upon a preferred list of persons to the exclusion of everybody else. Washington is a beautiful city. It is an education to anyone to live here. The very opportunity of living here for a while would be an incentive to endeavor to boys and girls in every State in the Union, but, under this Republican law, to them the door of hope is closed.

This proposed change in the law could easily be surrounded with safeguards which would guarantee the very best service to the Government. For instance, persons required to do technical or expert work might be exempted from the provisions of this

amendment.

One thing is very certain. The present law is not giving satisfaction, and recent developments in the Post-Office Department indicate that the present law does not guarantee either efficiency

or honesty in the administration here. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], chairman of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, I would like to ask him a question. He spoke of the sentiment throughout the country in favor of the civil-service or merit systhroughout the country in tayor of the civil-service or merit sys-tem. I want to ask him if he does not think that the confidence of the people is becoming shaken in that system by reason of the arrears of work in the Executive Departments in Washington, by reason of the constant pressure of the clerks for a civil-pension list, and by reason of their protest against the enforcement of the law requiring seven hours of service from them?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it never occurred to me that there was any feeling in the country against the clerks because of the civil-service system.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No; I said sentiment in the country against the civil-service system caused by the action of the clerks here in the Eventive Departments. Is not that confidence clerks here in the Executive Departments. Is not that confidence

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. As I understand it, the gentleman asks me if the confidence of the public is not shaken by

the fact that the clerks are eager to get a civil-pension list?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is one proposition.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No, I do not. I do not think the country has seen any sign that such a proposition will be suc-

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. As to the arrears of the Departments in work, and the constant request by the Departments for more clerks and appropriations in order to get proper service?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not suppose that that fact is very well known throughout the country.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. How as to the protest of the employees against working seven hours a day, as by law required?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I never heard that there was

any rebellion against it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Not until within a few days, but the gentleman has read the papers and knows what is in the

papers.
Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Yes, unfortunately for myself, I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Now, as to the suggestion of the gentleman in relation to the employees incapacitated from performing the service required. This bill provides that the employees who are disabled from the performance of service shall receive none of the appropriations made by this bill. Will not that correct radically any evil in the system in reference to employees unable to perform the services required?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it ought to

correct the whole evil. As I said to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hepburn], it is in the power of the Department to-day to correct this evil which, I think, is a crying one. The trouble is the heads of the Departments will not enforce the law. Similar provision was put in the appropriation bill three or four years ago, commanding the heads of Departments to discharge all incompetent clerks, and yet the heads of the Departments came before the committee and admitted that they did not discharge them. They will not discharge them. The trouble is not in the them. They will not discharge them. The trouble is not in the

law, but in the enforcement of the law.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts himself, under the same circumstances, discharge these old and

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I am not in a position now

to decide that. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Of course he would not. You can not remedy this law in this way, because, thank God, you have to use human agency. You have to have men, and they will not

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. How would the gentleman

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. How would the gentleman from Iowa get rid of the superannuated clerks?

Mr. HEPBURN. I would limit the term of office so that the passage of time would do what men will not do.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That is a suggestion often made; the trouble is that it comes back to the same point. The suggestion that he makes is that at the end of a certain number of years they shall go out, but may be reappointed by the appointing power. Is it not probable that the same appointing power which to-day refuses to obey the law to discharge them when they which to-day refuses to obey the law to discharge them when they ought to will perfunctorily reappoint them and simply sign a list and keep them right there? I do not see why it is any more difficult for the head of a Department to discharge a superannuated clerk than it is for him to refuse to reappoint him.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. SCUDDER. I would like to ask the gentleman what would

be the objection to an age limit?

be the objection to an age limit?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I have introduced a bill for a number of Congresses for an age limit. I am in favor of that measure.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of this question, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], proceeding on an extension of time granted at my request, was so inconsiderate of my request that he would not permit me to interrupt him when he stated that I had rehemently attacked protocolly. him when he stated that I had vehemently attacked not only the system of the civil-service law, but a Commissioner who was

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not know where the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] procured the letter he read purporting to be a letter from former Commissioner Procter. He did not state where he got the letter. I had never seen it before or heard of it. I have never seen it in the records of the investigations had and transmitted to the House by the Postmaster-General. But, Mr. Chairman, I do find this in this report here in regard to this transaction: The Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, upon the twenty-fourth page of this communication, after detailing the many and various violations of law and misconduct by this appointee, Louis, says in conclusion:

From the foregoing it appears that the appointment of M. W. Louis as cashier of the Kansas City post-office, when it was not intended that he should perform any service whatever in that office, was irregular, and that his assignment as acting superintendent of the division of supplies while carried on the rolls and paid as an employee of the Kansas City post-office was unlawful—

and recommends that he be summarily removed from office. And Louis was removed October 21, 1903, after having been in office under this illegal and unlawful appointment for six years

In the memorandum submitted to us by the President with this document when it was transmitted to us, I find that Messrs. Bonaparte and Conrad, special counsel retained by the President to aid in the prosecution of the violators of the law in these matters, speaking of the Bristow report, say:

We heartily commend the report and deem its conclusions fully justified by the facts it sets forth; and while regretting in common with all patriotic citizens that the grave abuses of long standing which it reveals should have grown up in the Post-Office Department, we consider the exposure of these abuses and the attempts made to punish those responsible for them a work of the highest public utility, quickly and ably performed.

Following that, here is what the President himself has said: In all that is thus said of the report of Mr. Bristow I cordially agree.

Yet the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Coopen], so far forgetful both of the courtesies due from one Member of this House

to another and of the truth of the facts, stated that I had assaulted and slandered the Commission, one of whom was dead.

If a slander has been made, if something that is not true has been promulgated to the public and solemnly communicated to this House by the President with his indorsement—not only that, but with his "cordial" indorsement—I say if a slander has been spoken, then the President of the United States and the officials of spoken, then the President of the United States and the officials of the Government selected by him to make this investigation and report, and not myself, have assaulted and slandered the Commission. The facts upon which I have based my statements made here are in the records and archives of this Government, and whether true or false they will remain there. If they are not the truth, the President and his officials are responsible for it, not I.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and pending amendment be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the motion agreed to,
The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of
the gentleman from Iowa, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 33 strike out all of the paragraph beginning with line 5, "Civil rvice Commission," down to and including line 30.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gillett of Massachusetts) the Chair announced that there were 75 voting in the affirmative and 56 in the negative. Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers. Tellers were ordered.

Mr. HEPBURN and Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts were appointed

The question was again taken; and the tellers reported 78 in the affirmative and 65 in the negative.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to give notice that when this paragraph comes before the House in the consideration of the bill that with reference to the paragraph I shall demand

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any Member of the House has the right to demand the yeas and nays on this amendment in the House.

Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the Commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, \$8,500.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely proper to move at this point that this paragraph should be struck out. I therefore move to strike out the paragraph beginning with line 21 and ending with line 25

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the

gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$8,000; three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, at \$4,500 each; clerk to the Secretary, \$2,500; stenographer, \$1,800; three private secretaries, one to each Assistant Secretary, at \$1,800 each; Government actuary, under control of the Treasury, \$2,250; one clerk of class 4, who shall be a physician; one clerk of class 2; two clerks of class 1; one clerk, \$1,000; four messengers; three assistant messengers; and one laborer; in all, \$46,230.

Mr. RUSSELL. I observe that in line 4, on page 36, provision is made for "one clerk of class 4, who shall be a physician." I should like to know something about the reason for this provision.

Mr. BINGHAM. This is a new employment in connection with the subordinate force.

with the subordinate force.

It has been the experience of the Department as well as of great Government offices like the post-office in our cities, where there is a large subordinate force entitled to a qualified sick leave, that there should be some supervision, because it has been found very many persons can without difficulty secure a physician's certificate setting forth incapacity for work, when upon investigation it is found that the clerk or subordinate is qualified and physically fit to report for duty.

This provision has been made in the interest of economy and

expedition of work, for the reason that clerks, upon the approval of their chief, are entitled to their thirty days' sick leave, and it has been found that very many try to avail themselves of this provision improperly, perhaps at times when their services are most necessary to the work of the Department, and thus practically get thirty days' leave of absence to which they are not entitled.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of chief clerk and superintendent: For chief clerk, including \$300 as superintendent of Treasury building, \$3.000; assistant superintendent of Treasury building, \$2.500; inspector of electric-light plants, gas, and fixtures for all public buildings under control of the Treasury Department.

\$2,000; assistant inspector of electric-light plants and draftsman, \$1,000; five clerks of class 4; additional to one clerk of class 4, as bookkeeper, \$100; three clerks of class 3; three clerks of class 3; four clerks of class 1 (one as librarian); one clerk, \$1,000; one messenger; two assistant messengers; store-keeper, \$1,200; telegraph operator, \$1,200; telephone operator and assistant telegraph operator, \$1,200; chief engineer, \$1,400; three assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; six elevator conductors, at \$720 each; three firemen; five firemen, at \$500 each; coal passer, \$500; locksmith and electrician, \$1,400; two firemen, at \$400; two lieutenants of the watch, \$1,400; two lieutenants of the watch, \$1,400; two lieutenants of the watch, \$1,400; each; fifty-eight watchmen; six special watchmen, at \$720 each; foreman of laborers, \$1,000; skilled laborer, male, \$300; wireman, \$000; two skilled laborers, \$1,000; each; eighty-seven charwomen; foreman of cabinet shop, \$1,500; draftsman, \$1,200; ten cabinet makers, at \$1,000 each; cabinet makers, \$720; carpenter, \$1,000; carpenter's helper, \$630. For the Winder Building: Engineer, \$1,000; three firemen; conductor of elevator, \$720; four watchmen; three laborers, and one of whom, when necessary, shallassist and relieve the conductor of the elevator; laborer, \$480; and six charwomen. For the Cox Building, 1709 New York avenue: Three watchmen-firemen, at \$720 each; and one laborer; in all, \$181,220.

Mr. OLMSTED, I move to amend by striking out the last

Mr. OLMSTED. I move to amend by striking out the last ord. I wish to ask my distinguished colleague [Mr. BINGHAM] a question. In his able and comprehensive report I find enumerated on page 3 among the increased officers "one wireman," and that on page 3 among the increased officers "one wireman," and that is provided for in the paragraph just read. Now, as we have already provided for electrical wiremen and telephone operators and telegraph operators, I merely want to ask what particular wires this wireman is to operate or pull? [Laughter.]

Mr. BINGHAM. He is simply an assistant to the electrician—found necessary by the experience in connection with that very

large building, the Treasury Department. It was the judgment of the committee that the appointment of this officer would facilitate good administration of the physical conditions of the Depart-

That is the governing reason.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I understand this is an appointee of a spoilsman," to pull the wires. [Laughter.]
Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman may know more about that

than I do.

Mr. OLMSTED. I bow to the wisdom of my colleague as evinced in the statement he has just made, and withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Auditor for Navy Department: For Auditor, \$4,000; Deputy Auditor, \$2,500; law clerk, \$2,000; three chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; nine clerks of class 4; seventeen clerks of class 3; thirteen clerks of class 2; sixteen clerks of class 1; twelve clerks, at \$1,000 each; eight clerks, at \$900 each; one clerk, \$500; one messenger; one assistant messenger, and two laborers; in all, \$118,180.

Mr. LIND. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 25 on page 44 the following:
"The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow, in the settlement of the accounts of the disbursing officers of the Navy involved, credit for amounts paid to enlisted men of the Navy, at \$0 per month each, in lieu of quarters and rations while on recruiting duty."

Mr. BINGHAM. I reserve a point of order on the amendment. Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I will briefly state the facts that

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I will briefly state the facts that prompt me to offer this amendment, which I will say has been suggested by Secretary Moody, of the Navy Department.

On November 5, 1901, a young man by the name of Harley, who is in the service of the Navy—an enlisted man—was detailed for recruiting duty at Buffalo, N. Y., with others. There are about twenty-five enlisted men in the same position that he is. In the order detailing him for the service and under which he was sent to Buffalo, the Navy Department directed that the detailed men Buffalo the Navy Department directed that the detailed men should be allowed the usual commutation of rations, \$3 a month.

That being apparently insufficient for maintenance at Buffalo, the officer directing the detail added another clause—that in addition to the ordinary allowance of \$9 a month these men should have an allowance of \$5 a week, aggregating \$29 a month.

Under this order they have served for nearly two years. When

Under this order they have served for nearly two years. When the paymasters' accounts reached the accounting officers the Auditor of the Treasury for the Navy Department held that inasmuch as the Navy Department had made the allowance in two items, one of \$9 and the other of \$20 a month, they could not be allowed. It is the law, and it is conceded that it is within the power and province of the Navy Department to fix the allowances to men on detail. There is no question about that. It is not fixed by statute; it is fixed by regulation. And since this controversy has come up the Secretary of the Navy has fixed it in a lump sum at a dollar a day. at a dollar a day.

These young men drew the \$9 commutation of rations and the special allowance of \$20 per month for nearly two years. When, as I said, the accounts came in for settlement the Auditor checked the amount of the \$9 per month against their accounts, and we have this condition of affairs, that twenty-five young men including this young man from St. Paul, in my State, of good family and who is a young man of excellent character, have been in the service of the United States since last July, performing every duty, executing every order that has been given them. failing in nothing, without receiving one dollar of their pay. It has been withheld since last July. This young man, who has now

been transferred to the navy-yard in this city, came to me before the holidays with tears in his eyes. He had not received one penny from the Government since last July. I went to see the account-ing officer of the Treasury, the Auditor for the Navy. and asked him how he could tolerate such a condition of affairs. I asked him whether he was surprised that there were desertions from the Navy and from the Army when red tape was carried to that extent. "Oh, well," he said, "men of this class do not desert."

Now, I want the House to understand the ridiculous technicality

put this question to the Auditor:

"You concede, Mr. Auditor, that it was within the province of the Navy Department to fix the allowances of these men while they were performing this duty?"

"Yes."

Ves.

"If it had been fixed in one sum, as has been done subsequently, at a dollar a day, you would have allowed it?"

"Yes, sir."

"Yes, sir."
"You also concede that the Department allowed it at \$29 a month, but in two items, one item of \$9 being the regular commutation to a private when he is away from his vessel, and the other \$5 a week in addition to make \$29 a month?"
"Yes."

"Then," said I, "the reason that you refuse to pass this in the accounts is because the Department has made two items of that which, in your judgment, should have been allowed in one item?"

"Yes, sir; that is the reason."

That was the conversation I had with him.

Now I will send to the desk a letter from Secretary Moody, who asks that an amendment of this character be made. By the way, the amendment was drafted in his office. He apparently despairs of getting any sense of justice in the Treasury Department.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, January 4, 1904.

Washington, January 4, 4904.

Sir: Referring to the matter of the checkage of the \$9 a month paid in lieu of quarters and rations while on recruiting duty in the case of Ernest Harold Harley, hospital apprentice, first class, in which you have interested yourself, and other like cases, the Department finds, after a conference with the office of the Auditor for the Navy Department, that it is unable to afford any relief in the premises. It appears, therefore, to be a matter requiring Congressional action, and to this end I have prepared and submit herewith a form of amendment which it is suggested may be inserted in the urgent deficiency bill. The amount involved is not large, there being about twenty-five such cases.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

W. H. MOODY, Secretary.

Hon. JOHN LIND, House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LIND I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LIND. If any Member of the House has any question to ask about this matter, I shall be very glad to answer it.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no disposition on my part, after the

facts the gentleman has stated, to question the justice of his proposition, but its relevancy is not to this bill. Even the suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy is that it go to the deficiency bill, but in my opinion you should go to the Naval Committee of the House.

Mr. LIND. But, General, if you will bear with me just one

moment

Mr. BINGHAM. With pleasure.

Mr. LIND. These young men are virtually starving in the sense that they have not had one red penny of their salaries since last July, and this without any fault of their own. They have been referred from the Navy Department to the Treasury Department, from the Treasury Department to the Navy Department, and again to the Treasury Department; and now the Navy Department sends them here to ask relief on a bill that has not yet been reported. These young men are in want. The Government is doing its utmost to make vagabonds of them, and all because of red tape. If this involved new legislation I should not ask it, but the amendment is simply to cut a knot of red tape in the Auditor's office; that is all. The law is so plain that the Secretary of the Navy had the right to make these allowances that there can be no question about it. He made the order in good faith. I will

have one of the orders read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman, for his information, that immediately following this bill from the Committee on Appropriations will come the urgent deficiency till, and I think that the gentleman can get his amendment upon that bill. It has no relation to th's bill.

Mr. LIND. I understand that. Mr. BINGHAM. And while I have full sympathy with these

young men, just as much as my friend has, I should be inconsist-ent if I did not make my point of order against the amendment if offered to this bill.

Mr. LIND. I will ask the gentleman this question-

Mr. LIND. I will ask the gentleman this question—
Mr. BINGHAM. I would suggest to the gentleman that he
withdraw his appeal here, and let it go to the bill that follows
this. It will follow this immediately.
Mr. LIND. I will ask this question: Which of the two bills is
likely to be acted on first in the Senate?
Mr. BINGHAM. The urgent deficiency bill will pass this
House, go to the Senate, and come back. This bill will doubtless
not be considered by the Senate for a month. The urgent deficiency bill will pass the two Houses, and you will get your legislation quicker.

Mr. LIND. Under the circumstances, I will withdraw the amendment; but I will ask the Clerk to read the indorsement which I sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Second indorsement.]

DFS.

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT,
February 5, 1903.

Subject—Relative to increase of subsistence allowed recruiting parties.
Respectfully returned to the office in charge of the United States naval recruiting station, Buffalo, N. Y.

recruiting station, Buffalo, N. Y.

The chief of bureau directs me to return this communication and to state that the correction recently issued relative to "Instructions for recruiting officers" has been erroneously construed by the recruiting staff.

Enlisted men who are not berthed and subsisted on board a receiving ship and who are members of a permanent recruiting party receive five (\$5) dollars per week for expenses and nine (\$9) dollars per month for subsistence.

ALEX. SHARP,

Lieutenant-Commander, United States Navy.

Mr. LIND. I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For wages of workmen and watchmen and not exceeding \$840 for other employees, \$4,200.

Mr. VAN DUZER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 64, lines 23 and 24, strike out the words "four thousand two hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "five thousand six hundred."

Mr. BINGHAM. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. VAN DUZER. Mr. Chairman, in looking over the items submitted in the bill now before the House I find that the appropriation for the wages of watchmen and workmen has been reduced from \$5,600 to \$4,200, and as the actual conditions in Nevada do not justify this reduction I simply desire to state the facts, which I believe should influence the House in restoring the amount to \$5,600 instead of \$4,200, as provided for this year.

I desire to call the attention of the members of the committee to the facts regarding the mineral conditions of the State of Nevada, which should make this amendment of more than passing interest to the Members of this House.

The State of Nevada since her discovery has produced \$1,544,-000,000 in gold and silver bullion, not to include lead and copper, an output exceeding that of any equal area in the world. For a number of years the production of mineral wealth declined in Nevada, but during the last three years science and discovery have again unlocked the riches hidden in our mountains. Science—which has conquered the subtle electrical fluid, which has yielded up to metallurgists the secrets of chemistry, and which has up to metallurgists the secrets of chemistry, and which has cheapened and invented new machinery—has enabled the famous Comstock, the greatest mining camp the world has ever known, to again work the lower levels of her mines, open up new bodies of ore hitherto inaccessible, to explore to depths hitherto regarded but as the dreams of sanguine mining men, and to work the millions of tons of low-grade ores known to exist in the upper levels of her mines.

The Comstock has produced in her day a sum variously estimated at about \$560,000,000. Magnificent, amazing, beyond the computation of the ordinary mind. The influence of that amount of wealth thrown into the channels of commerce, into the life of business, giving as it has inspiration to art and stimulating the energies and ambitions of mankind, has had a deeper, wider, and more far-reaching effect on modern civilization than the effect of any great battle in modern times. And yet to-day there lies within the grasp of man bodies of ore which we can not now compute, of a richness which only the assayer can determine, beneath the crown of Old Mount Davidson, which covers the wealth of

the Comstock.

I predict that when other mining camps whose reputations have dazzled financiers and stirred up the greed and avarice of promoters have been forgotten Virginia City will still be yielding her stores of wealth to influence our civilization and contribute to the happiness of mankind. This is what science has done for the mines of Nevada.

Discovery but three years ago uncovered in the heart of a Nevada desert a deposit of ore whose actual production has already

reached \$20,000,000, whose measured ore bodies are now represented at \$100,000,000, and whose possible output may rival that of the Comstock. This camp is Tonopah, and I venture the assertion that there is not a Member upon this floor whose constituents are not more or less interested in this wonderful camp, which contains the largest and richest mine in the world.

I only refer to the Comstock and to Tonopah, two camps which will have produced more than the combined output of many Western States. I will not now take up your time by saying that there are a dozen other camps in Nevada springing into wonderful life, with untold possibilities. Instead of offering an amendment to raise a paltry wage allowance, I ought to offer an amendment rehabilitating and reestablishing the Carson mint [applause], because Carson City is the natural gateway to this entire region, which promises to tax the capacities of all the coinage mints in

the country.

Carson City is located within 20 miles of Virginia City, generally better known as the Comstock, which has produced during the past year a million in gold and silver bullion. Carson is but 200 miles from Tonopah, and the wealth of Tonopah must pass her doors to be minted in San Francisco or some other city. Carson City to-day is the natural center of an area of country the most richly mineralized in the world. No city in the world is tributary to

more actual mineral wealth.

Within three years gentlemen from the city of Philadelphia— the city from which the distinguished gentleman in charge of this bill comes-have made investments in the State of Nevada and bill comes—nave made investments in the State of Nevada and have opened up a mining camp that promises to rival the great Comstock mine at Virginia City. Only within the past three months I visited my home, Tonopah, and in going through the Tonopah mines I walked underground for 10 miles through continuous workings and in solid ore, the walls of the drifts and tunnels fairly sparkling with mineral richness. It is estimated by eminent engineers in this country, men who have had experience in South Africa, and one a gentleman who is enjoying a salary of \$25,000 a year, that there are over \$75,000,000 worth of ore in of \$25,000 a year, that there are over \$75,000,000 worth of ore in sight in that one mine.

There are in the city of Philadelphia over twenty-two mining companies organized for the operating of mines at Tonopah. Tonopah is situated 200 miles from Carson City, and all her gold and silver bullion and assaying that is required to be passed upon in the mints of the United States must pass through Carson City.

I wish further to say that Carson City, where there was for-merly a United States mint, now reduced to an assay office, is merly a United States mint, now reduced to an assay office, is so situated that it is tributary to a greater mineral output than any single city in the United States to-day. So I say to the members of this committee that the demands which will be made upon Carson City assay office make it eminently fit and necessary that the appropriation, which has been cut down from the sum of \$5,600 to \$4,200, be raised. Mining history in Nevada is rapidly demonstrating that the abolition of the Carson mint was not only a locitative error but a political crime

a legislative error but a political crime.

Think of it! A mint situated in the heart of a mining district—
not only that, but in a section which has produced and will produce more than many mints could handle—the dies destroyed, the machinery removed. If the object of government is accommodation to its citizens and economy in administration, the condition of the Carson mint is certainly a striking example of a badly

mismanaged government.

The fact of the matter is, gentlemen of the committee, instead of having a reduction there ought to be a raising up to \$10,000 in workmen's wages. Now I wish to say to the gentlemen who have charge of this bill, and particularly to the distinguished gentlemen from the city of Philadelphia, that the Director of the Mint in making the recommendation possibly was not cognizant of the facts which go to prove that within the next twelve months the output from the town of Tonopah, in Nevada, alone will amount to between fifteen and twenty million dollars; that there is now being built into Tonopah a railroad at a cost of one-half a million dollars, and there will be erected large reduction works.

So I say the precessity for raising this preparation is one

million dollars, and there will be erected large reduction works. So I say the necessity for raising this appropriation is one which will make it necessary for the mint at Carson City to be able to handle the necessary work which will be brought there through the renewed mining industry in the State of Nevada, at Virginia City, and particularly at Tonopah, not to speak of one dozen camps which are now being placed upon the basis of a large operation in the southern portion of the State. Tonopah is the greatest mining camp of recent years. Already the ore bodies have been opened up for 1,100 feet in depth. Already her mines have begun to pay dividends. Already the sweet music of the stamp is heard where but a short time ago was the silence of the desert.

The people of the East have looked upon Nevada as a destitute desert; they have looked upon her, in fact, as a State which was given up, as gentlemen have said, to coyotes and sage hens, and I want to say to the gentlemen of this committee that the State of Nevada has poured into the lap of this nation enough money, were it now withdrawn from circulation, to bankrupt this nation. [Applause.] The State of Nevada was brought into this nation

under circumstances— The CHAIRMAN. Mr. VAN DUZER. The time of the gentleman has expired. I would ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada asks unanimous consent to continue for five minutes more. Is there objec-

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DUZER. I was stating the circumstances under which the State of Nevada was brought into this Union, and they are more interesting than those surrounding the birth of any other State in this Union.

The State of Nevada was admitted on the 31st day of October, 1864, and the constitution of the State had to be telegraphed to Washington in order to have the State admitted, because it required two votes in the United States Senate for the passage of the thirteenth amendment, and it was necessary that the State of

Nevada be admitted at that time——
Mr. RODEY. They do not admit them so rapidly now; at least we do not find it so.

Mr. RODEY. They do not admit them so rapidly now; at least we do not find it so.

Mr. VAN DUZER (continuing). And that distinguished American, Abraham Lincoln, at that time the President of the United States, said to the first Member of Congress from the State of Nevada, afterwards—as he placed his hands upon the shoulders of that gentleman, in the homely way so characteristic of Lincoln—"Thank God, the State of Nevada has been admitted, because we will now have a source from which we can get sufficient metallic money to supply the business of this nation."

Those were the conditions of our birth. For twenty years Nevada has languished; but to-day, as a result of the Newlands irrigation bill, which should stamp its author as an empire builder along with Jefferson and Benton, we are going to have a population of one-half million people. Tonapah will sustain our agricultural population. We are the young giant of the West, and the next census will show that Reno, Nev., has been the most rapidly growing city in the West. [Applause.]

Now, coming back to the point in question, I simply wish to say to the members of this committee, in justice to the State, in justice to the facts which I have stated—and I have stated them accurately and correctly—that the mining output of the State of Nevada to-day is going to be doubled and trebled and quadrupled, possibly, in the next five years.

There never was sufficient reason why the mint at Carson should have been reduced to an assay office, because if upon the theory that governments are constituted to reduce the expenses of the government generally by putting these institutions in places

theory that governments are constituted to reduce the expenses of the government generally by putting these institutions in places where the business of the country can be most economically managed, there is no reason to-day why the Carson assay office should not be restored to a mint as it formerly was, the mint capacity having been taken away from it. But all I ask this committee to do is simply that the original sum which has been appropriated for the wages of workmen and watchmen shall be

appropriated for the wages of workmen and watchmen shall be restored to what it was last year, namely, \$5,600, feeling assured that the rapidly growing output of Nevada bullion will necessitate the reestablishment of the mint.

Now, I do not know why this amount has been reduced from \$5,600 to \$4,200, and I do wish to say to the members of this committee that if you are going to do a simple act of justice, this item should be restored, because I have stated to you that as far as the Nevada and her wincered future are generated she to do. State of Nevada and her mineral future are concerned she to-day

state of Nevada and her mineral ruture are concerned she to-day is on the upgrade and will make a reputation for the output of gold and silver unequaled by any like area in the world.

California, which to-day has the reputation of being the Golden State, has not produced as much gold as the State of Nevada—as Nevada has produced in gold and silver. The State of Nevada has produced more than Arizona, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Utah. More than Alaska. More than Australia.

and Utah. More than Alaska. More than Australia.

The State of Nevada has produced more gold and silver than South Africa has produced in her mining history. The State of Nevada has produced more than Montana, Utah, and Colorado combined. And yet, I say, as magnificent as these figures are of the presentation I make, Nevada in her condition to-day as a mining State is in her infancy.

The surface of that State has hardly been scratched from the standnoint of mining and so I say there is no pagessity to reason.

standpoint of mining, and so I say there is no necessity, no reason, why the appropriations should be reduced in reference to the workmen in the mint from fifty-six hundred to forty-two hun-

point with pride to her history, though short in time, yet one

magnificent in achievement.

Brought into the Union under circumstances the most dramatic in history, having given to the nation her golden and silver stores, with her wealth so widely and generously distributed that art, science, literature, and commerce have alike benefited by her, proud that her riches have created the fortunes which to-day influence modern business life, proud that the wealth of her mines enabled John W. Mackay to circle the globe with the electricity of intelligence which makes the whole world kin in thought, sentiment, and ambition, she stands no longer a suppliant for charity, but justly demands that which the magnificence of her undeveloped resources entitle her to—no longer the rotten borough, but oped resources entitle her to—no longer the rotten borough, but
the future home of farmers, miners, a manufacturing population,
and a State to which commerce must look for her money metals
and the nation, when she needs them, for brave and courageous
American citizens. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the current law for the mint
at Correct City for ways of waykeners to which as I and or tend

at Carson City for wages of workmen, to which, as I understand, the gentleman's amendment applies, is \$5,600. The estimate submitted by the Department was \$4,200. The bill carries \$4,200. Therefore a point of order does not run against the gentleman's

As to the merits, I have no doubt the gentleman's remarks have made an impression on the House. With due respect to all the officials of the Government who make up the estimates in the book submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, the pleasure of seeing reduced estimates, I assure you, is most agreeable to the committee.

The details, as given by the gentleman from Nevada, were in no wise submitted to our committee. We simply accepted the judgment of the Director of the Mint in the estimate of the conduct of the mint at Carson City in the matter of wages of work-men, that it could be carried on at the lesser figure. I leave the whole question to the judgment of the committee. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Nevada.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

Territory of Arizona: For governor, \$3,000; chief justice and three associate judges, at \$3,000 each; secretary, \$1,800; interpreter and translator in the executive office, \$500; in all, \$17,300.

Mr. WILSON of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 71, line 15, after the word "governor" strike out the words "three thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "three thousand five hundred."

Also, on page 71, line 17, after the word "secretary," strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert the words "two thousand five hundred."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.
Mr. WILSON of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the object of this
amendment is to pay these officers the salaries fixed by law. I
call the attention of the committee to section 1845 of the Revised
Statutes, which is the organic act on this subject for the Territory of Arizona and other Territories, and it reads as follows:

From and after the 1st day of July, 1873, the annual salaries of the governors of the several Territories shall be \$3,500. The salary of the secretaries shall be \$2,500.

nors of the several Territories shall be \$3,500. The salary of the secretaries shall be \$2,500.

Now, I say that is the law which fixes the salary to be paid to these officers, and it has been so for years. This appropriation is not sufficient to pay the salaries at all; it is cutting them down. I submit, as a fair consideration of the matter, that when a salary is fixed by law it should be paid, and that unless the appropriation is sufficient it can not be done.

Now, it is certainly, Mr. Chairman, germane to the subject because it is on the question of the payment of salaries. This provision is not in compliance with the salary fixed by the law itself. Therefore I make the motion to amend that particular subject of which the bill speaks, and upon the particular point for which the law provides a fixed salary an amendment must necessarily be germane to an appropriation that does not cover it. It is unfair to the officer that fills the position. I know well the duties of the governor of my Territory, and that they go to the extent of requiring such an amount of his time, in fact all of it, that less than that amount he can not live upon at all. I know that the governor in the execution of his duties necessarily must pay his expenses and must necessarily draw his support to a considerable extent from his own private purse outside of his salary. I submit that, that being the law by the organic act (which is the constitution of the Territory), it should be covered by the appropriation in this bill.

Mr. RODEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will pre-

dred dollars. I will ask the gentlemen of the committee to stand by the amendment I have offered. [Applause.]

There is no necessity for the people of the East ever again to refer in terms of scorn and contempt to my State, Nevada. While there are no monuments to mark historic battlefields, no pages of her history made illustrious by deeds of soldier and sailor, yet I

Hawaii gets what amounts practically to \$8,000 a year, when you count up all the perquisites; the governor of Porto Rico gets \$5,000, and the judges of Oklahoma get \$4,000 per annum, while both the governors and judges of Arizona and New Mexico get but \$3,000

but \$3,000.

You will see that Arizona has not been treated fairly when the appropriation for the governor's salary in both New Mexico and Arizona is only \$3,000. Certainly it ought to be \$6,000 to pay them any sort of reasonable compensation. Respecting the secretary of so vast a territory as Arizona or New Mexico, the work of that office is tremendous. There is hardly a clerk in the Territory that does not get\$1,800 a year and it is certainly wrong to make the salary of the secretary of the Territory, who sometimes acts as governor, only \$1,800. It ought to be left at what the law fixes it. I believe the chairman having this bill in charge will concede that a point of order does not lie against this amendment at this time, because there is a statute requiring this to be paid, and nothing but the action of the committee cuts it down paid, and nothing but the action of the committee cuts it down lower than that.

I submit that it is fair to the Territories to have this amendment passed; that the Government takes the revenues of the Territories year after year, and has done so for forty years in Arizona and for fifty-five years in New Mexico. I submit that it is just that we should get some little portion of it back even in the way of the payment of the governor's salary. The salary is small enough even at \$3,500, and of course is so much more so at \$3,000. I hope the House will grant this amendment, and I will offer a

similar amendment in respect to New Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, of course the point of order does not stand against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Wilson]. However, it is proper for me to state to the House that some twenty-eight years ago under what was called the Holman rule, at a time when I believe Mr. Randall on that side of the House was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the committee reduced upward of 200 statutory compensations all along the line of the Departments, as well as in the Territories.

From that day to this that reduced compensation has been given. Appropriation bill after appropriation bill has continued the same practice with reference to the items considered by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona, and the House has been consistent in holding these allowances to the

figures contained in the bill.

I am free to say that the House in after action in many cases has gone back to the statutory provisions, but these have remained in the cases of the governor of New Mexico and the governor of Arizona, where there is a reduction of \$500. Your committee is of the opinion that it would be wise action on the part of the

House to let the bill stand as reported, with the salaries as fixed.

As to the compensation given the secretary of the Territory, I
think the gentlemen representing the two Territories will concur
with me when I make the statement to the House that the secretaryship of a Territory, so far as his compensation runs, is the
least consideration in the possession of that office. I think it is
common report that the office of secretary of a Territory with fees and allowances in some form receives a compensation running into thousands of dollars.

Mr. RODEY. That has been done away with in New Mexico

by statute.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement, but I make the statement that as a rule the office of secretary of a Territory was and is regarded as a valuable appointment. The matter rests with the judgment of the committee. The action of Congress with reference to the newest of the Territories, Oklahoma, is along this same line, allowing the governor \$3,000.

How about Hawaii and Porto Rico?

Mr. WILSON of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the law gives the salary to the governor, as has been stated by the chairman of the committee and as is stated by the amendment, and the action of the committee is but retaining from him that which the law gives him. I submit in all fairness that that is not just, and simply because it has not been resented heretofore, because the matter has not been called before the House for consideration heretofore, has not been called before the House for consideration heretofore, is no reason why this House or this committee should not deal fairly with that official now. The idea of this rule having been established in times gone by, and perhaps not resented at the time, I can not take as an answer to the fairness presented by the proposition that when the law gives a salary it is unfair for the power of this House to withhold it in the form of an appropriation bill. When the act creating the Territory gives it, it ought to be met by the appropriation, as others are met, and because unfairness has been done in the past it can not be an answer that it ought to be done now. Two wrongs do not make a right.

be done now. Two wrongs do not make a right,

Now, as to the salary of the secretary, the gentleman is correct that the perquisites of the office of secretary have heretofore been extremely high in that Territory. They have gone up into the thousands of dollars. But the last legislature took them away took the duties of the secretary away which went to make up this mammoth pile of coin for him, and those duties have been imposed upon another officer and through him the fees are now

turned into the treasury.

So it is not so prolific now. I believe the perquisites of that office may be about the amount you appropriate for salaries—about \$1,500 or \$1,800. But the services performed by the secreabout \$1,500 or \$1,800. But the services performed by the secretary of the Territory are many. He does all the Federal duty; he does all the Territorial duty pertaining to the Territory. He keeps all the records, both national and Territorial. And the amount that he receives, together with the Territorial allowances, is not sufficient to afford him more than a decent living, unless the salary which the law gives him be allowed. The law gives him this amount; why should the Committee on Appropriations with the law staring them in the face, take it away? I subtions, with the law staring them in the face, take it away? I submit that the amendment ought to prevail. I ask in all fairness that it be adopted.

that it be adopted.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think we may well consider in this connection that the salary proposed in the bill is certainly as much as a great many of the States pay. For instance, I understand the great State of Nebraska, near these Territories, pays a salary of \$2,500; yet we propose to give to this still unformed Territory \$3,000. I know that in a number of the New England States small salaries are paid to governors, some much smaller than this; and in a great many of the Western States, if I am not misinformed, the salary is not as large as that provided for this Territory in the bill.

Inasmuch as it has been the practice of Congress for twenty years to make this appropriation, and inasmuch as this allowance

years to make this appropriation, and inasmuch as this allowance is certainly quite as large as a great many of the States allow to officers of a similar class, I think the salary appropriated in the bill might be allowed to remain as it has continued year after ear, with no material change, whichever side had control of

The question having been taken on the amendment of Mr. WIL-

son of Arizona,

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I call for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 50, noes 37. Mr. BINGHAM. I ask for tellers.
Tellers were ordered; and Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. WILSON of

Arizona were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 54,

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of Arizona. I desire to offer an amendment changing the total of this appropriation.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 19, page 71, after the words "in all," strike out "\$17,300" and insert "\$18,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Territory of New Mexico: For governor, \$3,000; chief justice, and four associate judges, at \$3,000 each; secretary, \$1,800, and interpreter and translator in the executive office, \$500; in all, \$20,800.

Mr. RODEY. I move to amend by inserting, after the word "thousand," in line 6, page 72, the words "five hundred;" so as to make the salary of the governor of New Mexico \$3,500; and to strike out in lines 7 and 8, on the same page, the words "one thousand eight hundred dollars" and insert "\$2,500."

Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the same amendment just adopted

with reference to the other Territory.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropria tions desires to be wholly consistent with the action it has taken in researce to the other Territories. Without going into discussion further, the matter may be left to the action of this com-

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. Rodey, there were on a division (called for by Mr. BINGHAM)—ayes 42,

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RODEY. I ask unanimous consent that the total amount of the paragraph be corrected in accordance with the vote just

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection, that change will be made.

There was no objection. The Clerk read as follows:

Record and Ponsion Office: For chief clerk, \$2,000; 5 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; 34 clerks of class 4; 53 clerks of class 3; 83 clerks of class 2; 186 clerks of class; 48 clerks, at \$1,000 each; engineer, \$1,400; assistant engineer, \$990; 2 firemen; skilled mechanic, \$1,000 finessengers; 38 assistant messengers; messenger boy, \$360; 5 watchmen; superintendent of building, \$250; and 17

laborers; in all, \$601,570; and all employees provided for by this paragraph for the Record and Pension Office of the War Department shall be exclusively engaged on the work of this office for the fiscal year 1905.

Mr. BINGHAM. I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out in line 2 of page 77 the word "thirty-four" and inserting "thirty-six." The purpose of this amendment is simply to correct a misprint, the sum total of the appropriation remaining the same.

The amendment of Mr. BINGHAM was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

So much of the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1888 as authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to employ, and pay out of the appropriations for new ships, such civilian expert aids, additional draftsmen, writers, copyists, and model makers on the designs therefor as may be necessary, is repealed, to take effect on and after July 1, 1904.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 23, 24, and 25 on page 85, and lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 86, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"On and after July 1, 1904, it shall not be lawful for the Secretary of the Navy to employ in the Navy Department at Washington, D. C., and pay out of the appropriations for new ships, any civilian expert aids, additional draftsman, writers, copyists, and model makers, except as herein or as may hereafter be specifically authorized."

The amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

The services of draftsmen and such other technical services as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary may be employed in the Bureaus of Construction and Repair and Steam Engineering to carry into effect the various appropriations for "Increase of the Navy," to be paid from such appropriations: Provided, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1965 shall not exceed \$120,000; a statement of the persons employed hereunder and the compensation paid to each shall be made to Congress each year in the annual estimates.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, a committee amendment. The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 96, in line 13, after the word "of," insert the words "ordnance, equipment."

The amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

For the following in lieu of employees now authorized and paid from appropriations for "new ships:" For one clerk, at \$1,100; five clerks, at \$1,000 each; three messenger boys, at \$600 each; in all, \$7,900.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, a committee amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.
The Clerk read as follows:

On page 99, in line 7, strike out the words "new ships" and insert in lieu thereof the words "public works."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The services of skilled draftsmen and such other technical services as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary may be employed in the Bureau of Yards and Docks to carry into effect the various appropriations for "public works" to be paid from such appropriations: Provided, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1905 shall not exceed \$30,000; a statement of the persons employed hereunder and the compensation paid to each shall be made to Congress each year in the annual estimates.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill the reason why these appropriations take this form? Why do you authorize an expenditure out of an appropriation for another use, rather than make an appropriation

direct for it?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman that it comes under the action of Congress a year ago, when the question was before the Committee on Appropriations as to the money expended by the Navy Department in the employment of subordinate force, and drawing from the general fund "Increase of the Navy."

The gentleman, of course, is not familiar with the hearings, but it developed that the Secretary stated to the committee a year ago that he had uncontrollable authority under the law to draw upon the fund for the increase of the Navy, which runs to the millions of dollars for new ships, for the subordinate force in his Department. He comes to the committee, under the injunction of the Congress, and submits to us his clerical force, under recognized assignments and salaries, now employed upon the per diem roll and paid from the allowances under the "Increase of the Navy."

We called before us the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and submitted to him the whole proposition, the general

Affairs and submitted to him the whole proposition, the general repeal of the law, the transfer of the clerks now employed under that appropriation, "Increase of the Navy," as well as an additional appropriation from the fund of the increase of the Navy of \$120,000, in order that the Secretary might employ that variable quantity in employment called "draftsmen" and subordinates necessary to aid the draftsman force; and for the public-works appropriation \$30,000.

Therefore we take up these clerks in the several paragraphs that we have passed, and make them a part of the establishment of the naval administration in the Department, in order first that there shall be an exhibit of what the real subordinate force costs the Navy Department in administration, as well as an annual control of that force in this bill, the same as we have control of every other department of the Navy.

Mr. HEPBURN. All of these clerks, then, that are authorized

under these two paragraphs——
Mr. BINGHAM. Under all the paragraphs running to the Navy Department.
Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). Become a part of the perma-

Mr. BINGHAM. Become a part of the permanent force, as they virtually now are. The only variable force are the draftsmen.

Mr. HEPBURN. But instead of being paid directly—
Mr. BINGHAM. They are being paid directly by this appropriation, and we take them up in our annual budget.

Mr. HEPBURN. But you diminish, do you not, the appropriation that is made for many shire to the amount that is authorized.

ation that is made for new ships to the amount that is authorized to be paid to these clerks?

Mr. BINGHAM. We have heretofore.

Mr. HEPBURN. So it is an indirect way of doing this, is it not?
Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no; this is the direct way. The other
was the indirect way. The Secretary had authority under existing law to draw upon the fund for the increase of the Navy for any unlimited subordinate force he desired.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, has he that power

.Well, has he that power now?

Mr. BINGHAM. He has at this moment. Mr. HEPBURN. Ought he to have it?

Mr. BINGHAM. Now we propose to stop it.
Mr. HEPBURN. Does that stop it?
Mr. BINGHAM. It stops it absolutely, and is recommended by the Secretary.

I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TAWNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9480, the legislative appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (S. 2300) to supplement and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Grays Point, Mo.," approved January 26, 1901; when the Speaker signed the same.

ENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. R. 32. Joint resolution to fill vacancies in the Board of Reents of the Smithsonian Institution—to the Committee on the Library.
S. 1753. An act for the relief of Pay Clerk Charles Blake, United

S. 2820. An act for the relief of Hamilton D. South-to the Committee on Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. Knapp, for five days, on account of important business. To Mr. Pujo, for two weeks, on account of important business. To Mr. Davey of Louisiana, for two weeks, on account of important business.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill (H. R. 4) entitled "A bill to prevent discrimination against members of Indian tribes attending religious or private schools," for the purpose of correcting the title on the back of the bill, in which the word "prevent" has been printed "prevent".

permit."
The SPEAKER. Without objection, consent will be granted. There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CUSTOMS APPRAISER AT PITTSBURG, PA.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6804 and to put it on its passage.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6804) providing for the appointment of a customs appraiser at Pittsburg, Pa.

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the customs collection district of Pittsburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, an appraiser, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and with compensation at the rate of \$3,000 per annum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reserving the right to object, I would like the gentleman to make an explanation.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask the gentleman why it is necessary that the appointment of this man should be made with the consent of the Senate? If he will consent, I will move to strike out those words.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I would rather not. I think that would be very unusual and would imperil the passage of the bill. This is a Treasury bill, which is reported unanimously from the Committee on Ways and Means, and there is quite a lengthy explanation of it in a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury addressed to the committee and embedied in the report. Some twenty years to the committee and embodied in the report. Some twenty years ago, under a section of the Revised Statutes, the Secretary of the Treasury abolished the office of appraiser at the port of Pittsburg, and from that time on the duties of appraiser have been performed by various parties, first one and then the other, assigned to that duty by the collector of the port. This is an exceedingly bad practice, according to the officials of the Treasury. But the more especial and the most substantial reason for the appointment of this officer now is that during the last five years the business of the port of Pittsburg has increased 300 per cent. Every ness of the port of Pittsburg has increased 300 per cent. Every other port of the country that has an amount of business corresponding with that done at Pittsburg has its appraiser.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The

Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed. On motion of Mr. Dalzell, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move you that the House do

now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as

Message from the President, transmitting a report by the Acting Secretary of State in regard to application of British embassy in behalf of Messrs. Gordon, Ironsides & Fares Company (Limited), of Canada, for reimbursement of \$7,626.08, alleged that the United States customs authorities improperly exacted as duties on certain sheep and cattle in November, 1902.

Message from the President transmitting a report from the

Message from the President, transmitting a report from the Acting Secretary of State, with inclosure from the ambassador of the French Republic, relative to the desire of certain French citizens to present to this Government a reproduction of the bust of Washington by David d'Angers, which the donors wish to have

Washington by David d'Angers, which the donors wish to have placed in the Capitol, with recommendations that Congress accept the gift.

A letter from the president of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting the resignation of Sidney G. Cooke as manager—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on projects of improvement of Warroad Harbor and Warroad River, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with accompanying illustrations. accompanying illustrations.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting official reports of the claim of the Imperial Coal Company, of Gibraltar—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriations for public printing and binding for the Interior Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

tions, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for Indian school, Truxton Canyon, Arizona—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for improvement at Ellis

Island immigration station, New York—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Winthrops Cove, New London Harbor, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending legislation relating to the pay for gunners of field artillery and inclosing the draft of a bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered

to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Georgetown Harbor, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with accompanying illus-

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Mississippi River at Moline, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with accompanying illustra-

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a reply to the resolution of the House inquiring as to the expenditures in the enforcement of antitrust laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 29) providing for the transfer of certain military rolls and records from the Interior and other Departments to the War Department, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 298); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6804) providing for the appointment of a customs appraiser at Pittsburg, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 299); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 652) making Chester, Pa., a subport of entry, and a bill of the House (H. R. 6808) on the same subject, reported the Senate bill without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 300); which said bill and report were referred to the

port (No. 300); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar. The House bill accompanying the report was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DOUGHERTY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 5767, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 9891) giving the consent of Congress to the removal of the restrictions on the sale of Puyallup allotted lands, and confirming and legalizing sales thereof since March 3, 1903, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 301); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar. House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows

Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8817) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander F. Butler, late of Louisa County, Va., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 297); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6755) granting a pension to Fred B. Willis-Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Com-

mittee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4941) granting a pension to Mary J. Wilson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 754) granting a pension to John M. Lawton-Com-

mittee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions

A bill (H. B. 2536) to suppress and prevent unfair and dishonest competition in trade—Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (H. R. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Susie G. Seabury—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7368) granting a pension to Annie G. Norwood—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9323) to amend so much of an act approved March 3, 1903, as authorized the erection and completion of new buildings for the accommodation of the United States naval hospital, Washington, D. C., as concerns the location thereof—Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 9585) granting an increase of pension to Nelson McIntosh—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and re-

ferred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9616) granting a pension to Thomas Dagnon—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 9867) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Paragould, in the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 9868) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the city of Sheboygan, Sheboygan County, State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Also, a bill (H. R. 9869) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Beaverdam, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 9870) for the relief of farmers and tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 9871) to authorize the Buck-

hannon and Northern Railroad Company, a corporation under the laws of the State of West Virginia, to build a bridge across the Monongahela River near the town of Rivesville, in the State of West Virginia-to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Com-

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 9872) providing for the licensing of custom-house brokers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 9873) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at San Diego, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9874) for an additional judge in the fourth judicial circuit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 9875) granting to the Davenport Water Power Company rights to construct and maintain wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River at Daven-port, Iowa—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Com-

Also, a bill (H. R. 9876) making State historical societies designated depositories of public documents—to the Committee on

Printing.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9877) to provide an eight-hour workday for post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 9878) to amend an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9879) to in-

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9879) to increase the compensation of rural free-delivery carriers—to the

Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHERMAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 9880) to authorize the maintenance of actions for negligence causing death in maritime cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 9881) providing for the adjustment and payment of accounts of laborers and mechanics arising wards the circle hour law.

ment and payment of accounts of taborers and inechanics arising under the e ght-hour law—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAYTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9882) allowing two months' extra pay to enlisted men of the United States Navy during the war with Spain who served outside the United States, and one month's extra pay to such as served within the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 9883) to fix the compensation of light-house keepers and to provide for their retirement on half pay-to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9884) providing for the purchase of the Temple Farm, at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9885) to provide for the erection of a public building in the town of Suffolk, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9886) granting Gould P. Austin, of Phoebus, Va., permission to erect a building upon the Government reservation at Fortress Monroe, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs

Also, a bill (H. R. 9887) to provide for acquirement, by condemnation, of lands at Cape Henry, Virginia, for the purpose of fortification and coast defense—to the Committee on Appropriations. By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 9888) appropriating \$4,500,000 for the purchase of submarine torpedo boats—to the Committee

on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 9889) granting Gould P. Austin, of Phoebus, Va., permission to erect a building upon the Government reservation at Fortress Monroe, Va.—to the Com-

mittee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 9890) to pension the Nebraska Territorial Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs: A bill (H. R. 9891) giving the consent of Congress to the removal of the restrictions on the sale of Puyallup allotted lands, and confirming and legalizing sales thereof since March 3, 1903-to

the House Calendar.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9892) giving the consent of Congress to the removal of the restrictions on the sale of Puyallup allotted lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LILLEY: A bill (H. R. 9893) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9894) to incorporate the American Academy in Rome.

corporate the American Academy in Rome—to the Committee on

the Library.

By Mr. VANDIVER: A bill (H. R. 9895) providing for the erection of a public building at Cape Girardeau, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A resolution (H. Res. 140) for appointment by the Secretary of War of a board of survey to determine the value of the Hygeia Hotel-to the Committee on Military

Anars.

By Mr. WACHTER: A resolution (H. Res. 141) authorizing chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills to appoint additional clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting Congress to pass a law increasing compensation of certain rural letter carriers of the United States to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of Oregon, con-cerning the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 9896) granting a pension to Jane Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9897) granting a pension to William Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 9898) granting an increase of pension to Orsen Hauser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: A bill (H. R. 9899) granting a pension to Frances Marilla Buell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9900) granting a pension to Charles B. Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 9901) granting a pension to John M. Stoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9902) for the relief of Samuel T. King—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9903) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harlan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions,

tee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 9904) for the relief of Faxon, Horton & Gallagher and other parties-to the Committee on

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 9905) granting an increase of pension to Peter Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 9906) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Dunn—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 9907) granting an increase of pension to John C. Dearing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 9908) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Alden—to the Committee on In-

valid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9909) granting a pension to George P. Ballough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 9910) for the relief of Hugh O'Reilly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9911) granting an increase of pension to Esther Skellie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9912) granting an increase of pension to Simon Elgiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9913) for the relief of Joel Townsend—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9914) granting an increase of pension to Florence Mahoney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9915) granting an increase of pension to Irvin F. Hoyt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9916) granting a pension to Catharine A. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 9917) granting a pension to Gertrude Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 9918) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 9919) to amend the military record of Henry Keeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9920) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Montgomery—to the Committee on Military Claims. War Claims

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 9921) granting a pension to Virginia Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 9922) granting an increase of pension to William J. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 9923) granting an increase of pension to James C. Daly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 9924) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

Also, a bill (H. R. 9925) for the relief of A. T. Pieratt—to the

Also, a bill (H. R. 9925) for the relief of A. T. Pieratt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 9926) granting an increase of pension to Ira Waldo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9927) for the relief of Alden K. Riley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 9928) granting a pension to Jacob Goetz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 9923) granting an increase of pension to Frederick K. Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9930) granting a pension to Alfred Melvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9931) authorizing the appointment and retirement of Charles Chaille-Long with the rank of colonel, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 9932) granting a pension to Lilburn E. Taber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9933) granting a pension to Marvin Coshun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 9934) granting a pension to Mary J. Germaine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9935) to remove the charge of description from the military record of Legenth Willey.

charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Wileyto the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9936) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter O. Wellington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9937) granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Conant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 9938) granting an increase of pension to Manning D. Birge—to the Committee on Invalid

By Mr. LUCKING: A bill (H. R. 9939) granting a pension to Martha Higgins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9940) granting a pension to Marie Ferguson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 9941) to place Dr. Henry Smith on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on

Military Affairs

Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9942) granting a pension to Emma V. Simmonds—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9943) granting a pension to Thomas Allen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9944) granting a pension to Frances A. Almy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9945) granting a pension to Mrs. J. McDonald Armistead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9946) for the relief of Mary Cornick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9947) for the relief of Charles Candy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9948) for the relief of the widow of Joseph

Culley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of Mary L. Bernard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9950) for the relief of William Edward Bailey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9951) for the relief of Louise S. Guthrie

Also, a bill (H. R. 9951) for the relief of Louisa S. Guthrie, widow and executrix of John J. Guthrie, deceased-to the Com-

mittee on Claims.

Mittee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9952) for the relief of Martha Louisa Whittaker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9953) for the relief of the Western Branch Baptist Church, Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9954) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Wright—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9955) for the relief of George W. Wood—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9956) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Lowe and

the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9956) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Lowe and Mrs. Angelina L. Thorpe, daughters of the late Isaac Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9957) for the relief of E. J. Seeds—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9958) for the relief of the First Baptist Church, Suffolk, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9959) for the relief of Mary E. O. Dashiell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9960) for the relief of Charles Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9961) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Augustus Thomas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

tee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9982) for By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9962) for the relief of the Primitive Baptist Church, colored, of Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 9963) granting a pension to Grace Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9964) for the relief of Arlington C. Denike—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 9965) for the relief of R. R. Aycock—to the Committee on War Claims.

to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9966) for the relief of W. T. Newbill—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9967) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth M. Brickell, late widow of John P. Law, as special agent of the thirteenth district of Illinois provost-marshal-general's office, United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9968) granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Roberts—to the Committee on In-

valid Pensions

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9960) granting an increase of pension to James Frederick-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, a bill (H. R. 9970) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Shaffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions,
By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 9971) to place David Robertson, sergeant, first class, Hospital Corps, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 9972) for the relief of William A. Clark—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9973) granting a pension to Augusta D. Murdock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9974) granting a pension to Julia J. Hubble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9975) granting a pension to Amelia Perkins— to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9976) granting an increase of pension to George R. Beach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9977) granting an increase of pension to William R. Hibbord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 9978) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Iverson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9979) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Iverson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9979) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9980) granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Haradon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9981) for the relief of Darwin S. Hall—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 9982) granting an increase of pension to Edwin sion to George R. Roraback-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 9983) to correct the military

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 9983) to correct the military record of Wade H. Newman—to the Committee on Military Affairs. By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 9984) granting a pension to Joseph Osthelder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 9985) providing for donation of lots A, B, K, and L, in block 39, in Fort Dalles military addition to The Dalles, Oreg., as shown on the plat of the city of The Dalles and surroundings, and filed in the local land office at The Dalles, Oreg., to the Oregon Historical Society—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 9986) granting an

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 9986) granting an increase of pension to Michael McKenna—to the Committee on

By Mr. VANDIVER: A bill (H. R. 9987) granting an increase of pension to Jones Adler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Also, a bill (H. R. 9988) granting an increase of pension to William Ellis-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, a bill (H. R. 9989) granting a pension to William C. Kin-yon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9990) granting a pension to John Bartmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9991) to correct the military record of Addison Tennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 9992) for the relief of B. L. Davis—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9993) granting a pension to Absolem Hobbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9994) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 9995) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9996) granting a pension to Henry Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 9997) granting an increase of pension to William A. Duncan—to the Committee on

Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 9998) for the relief of James S. McDonogh, Harry A. Hegarty, and James A. Toomey, for professional services rendered and costs expended in case of United States against Robert West—to the Committee on

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 8903, granting a pension to Sarah F. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, relating to reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 6823, granting increase of pension to S. R. Pollard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 7307, granting increase of pension to Mary Tichenor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Sam Montieth Post, No. 172, Grand Army of the Republic, of Fennimore, Wis., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Resolution of Robert Anderson Post, No. 68, Grand Army of the Republic, of Waterloo, Iowa; J. W. McKenzie Post, No. 81, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hampton, Iowa, and James Roller Post, No. 220, Grand Army of the Republic, of Clarksville, Iowa, in favor of a service-pension bill-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolution of the Western Retail Implement Dealers' Association, favoring amendment to Senate bill 1261 so as to exempt inter and mutual insurance companies—to

the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURKETT: Letter of M. E. Smith & Co., against passage of a parcels-post bill-to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Papers to accompany bill to correct military record of Samuel T. King—to the Committee on Military

Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of Charles A. Clark Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Ridgefarm, Ill., and Gilman Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Gilman, Ill., favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIELS: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., approving construction of a trail up Mount Whitney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Resolutions of William D. Wilkins Post, No. 91; General Wool Post, No. 164, and Julius T. Barrett Post,

No. 173, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan in favor of a service-pension bill-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of New York Produce Exchange, favoring deepening the Harlem channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring arbitration of international questions—to the Committee on

Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill granting a pension to Gertrude Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of Philadelphia Maritime

Exchange, favoring arbitration treaties between the United States

and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of New York Produce Exchange, urging legislation to deepen the Harlem or Bronx Kills to 18 feet—to the Com-

mittee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany bill to correct military record of Henry Keeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Denver Chamber of Commerce, in relation to

ship subsidies—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of Grain Dealers' National Association, in re-

lation to inspection of grain at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Grocers' Association of Rockford, Ill., in relation to interstate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate

and Foreign Commerce Also, resolution of Rutland Post, No. 292, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, in favor of a service-pension

Republic, Department of Illinois, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Petition of pastor and congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Vineland. N. J.; also, petition of pastor and congregation of the West Baptist Church; also, petition of pastor and congregation of First Baptist Church, favoring passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: Petition of the Northern California Indian Association, praying for the relief of the landless Indians of northern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Resolution of the New York Produce Exchange, in opposition to the inspection of grain by the Govern-ment at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring arbitration treaties between United States and foreign coun-

Also, resolution of the New York Produce Exchange, favoring the deepening of the Harlem or Bronx Kills—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the executive committee of the Supervisors' Highway Convention, at Albany, N. Y., in favor of the Brownlow bill relative to road improvement—to the Committee on Agricul-

Also, resolution of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, favoring improvement in the harbor channels of the port of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Papers to accompany bill to pension Vir-

ginia Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: Resolution of the Citizens' Trade Association of Cambridge, Mass., favoring arbitration treaties between United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Massachusetts State Board of Trade, against discrimination in freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate

and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Boston Fruit Commerce Exchange, favoring enactment of law prohibiting alteration of published tariff rates of

reight—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, favoring amendment to laws requiring inspection of sailing vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolutions of A. B. Sturges Post, No.

73, Grand Army of the Republic, of Sturgis, Mich., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: Resolutions of Todd Post, No. 115, and Belknap Post, No. 515, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: Resolution of L. W. Frazier Post, No. 271, Grand Army of the Republic, Bethel, Ohio, against placing a statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee in Statuary Hall, in the Capitol building, Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library. Also, resolution of Kilpatrick Post, No. 189, Grand Army of the Republic Geshen, Ohio against placing status of Gen. Robert.

the Republic, Goshen, Ohio, against placing statue of Gen. Robert

E. Lee in Statuary Hall, Capitol building, Washington, D. C .- to

the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HITT: Resolution of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, in favor of consular reform-to the Committee on Foreign

Also, resolution of Holden Putman Post, No. 646, Grand Army of the Republic, of Shannon, Ill.; William H. Thompson Post, No. 308, Grand Army of the Republic, of Paw Paw, Ill.; John L. Hostetter Post, No. 785, Grand Army of the Republic, of Chadwick, Ill., and Amboy Post, No 572, Grand Army of the Republic, of Amboy, Ill., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Hawaii, against passage of Senate bill 289—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Bar Association of Honolulu, Hawaii, asking in the Bar Association of Honolulu, Hawaii

ing increase of justices for supreme court from three to five-to

the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of General Wilson Post, No. 432, Grand Army of the Republic, of Kellogg, Iowa, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 9594, for the relief of William A. Denton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Resolution of Berneman Post, No. 79; Harry Rust Post, No. 54, and William K. Kimball Post, No. 148,

Harry Rust Post, No. 54, and William K. Kimball Post, No. 148, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maine; and Twenty-third Regiment Association, of Maine, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Resolutions of La Grange Post, No. 97, Grand Army of the Republic, of Windom, Minn., and of Stephen Miller Post, No. 139, Grand Army of the Republic, of Woodstock, Minn., in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT. Papers to accompany bill H. R. 1150, for

the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 1150, for the relief of Hiram Lodge, No. 7, Free and Accepted Masons, of Franklin, Tean.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of business men and citizens of Penn Yan, N. Y., in opposition to parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PRINCE: Paper to accompany bill providing for a public building at Kewanee, Henry County, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of the Retail Merchants' Association, Geneseo, Ill., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of T. T. Dow Post, No. 290, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

bill-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Also, protest of Knights of Maccabees of Galesburg, Ill., against passage of Dryden bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and

Post-Roads. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of business people of Beardstown, Ill., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Downing Post, No. 321, Grand Army of the

Also, resolution of Downing Post, No. 321, Grand Army of the Republic, of Virginia, Ill., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of the Primitive Baptist Church, of Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIDER: Petition of Charles Houghton, in favor of the construction of the Harlem Kill section of the Harlem Ship

Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors Also, resolution of the New York Preachers' Meeting, in relation to the treatment of naval chaplains—to the Committee on

Naval Affairs By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: Papers to accompany claim of John Lacotts—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolutions adopted by the board of man-

agers of the New York Produce Exchange, favoring the deepening of the Harlem (Bronx) Kills to 18 feet—to the Committee on

Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring arbitration treaties between the United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by representatives of grain exchanges, declaring against Government inspection of grain at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolution of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, favoring passage of bill to improve the Bronx Kills, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club of New York, protesting against trade-mark patent laws of Cuba—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 8410, grant- | ordered to be printed.

ing an increase of pension to George B. Fairhead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Resolution of the American

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Resolution of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, in opposition to bill H. R. 3573—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the executive committee of the Supervisors' Highway Convention, in favor of the Brownlow bill, relating to road improvement—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club of New York, in relation to trade-marks, patents, labels, etc.—to the Committee on Patents.

mittee on Patents.

Also, resolution of the New York Preachers' Meeting, in relation to the treatment of naval chaplains—to the Committee on Naval Affairs

Also, resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Association, in relation to the inspection of grain at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Manufacturers' Association of New

York, favoring the improvement of the harbor channels of the

Brooklyn water front—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.
By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of the New Haven and Coastwise Lumber Dealers' Association, in favor of a bill to establish
a forest reserve in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture

By Mr. REID: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Little Rock, Ark., relative to the improvement of the Mississippi River—to the

Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions adopted by representatives of grain exchanges, declaring against Government inspection of grain at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions favoring arbitration treaties between the United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign

Affairs.

Also, resolution of New York Produce Exchange, favoring passage of bill to improve the Bronx Kills, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Resolutions of Concord Post, No. 239; Scott Post, No. 43; Lucius Taylor Post, No. 274, and Morgan Parker Post, No. 281, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: Resolutions of Dushane Post, No. 3, and of Guys Post, No. 16, Grand Army of the Republic, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Baltimore Federation of Labor, in opposition to Senate bill providing for the payment of advanced wages in the coastwise trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Easton, Md., for passage of bill to forbid nullification of State liquor laws; also, from same organization, petition in favor of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings owned or used by the United States Government—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liq-

uor Traffic.

By Mr. WADE: Resolutions of Shelby Norman Post, No. 231, and Henry Seibert Post, No. 250, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Claus Groth Gilde, of Davenport, Iowa, protesting against passage of Hepburn bill relating to interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER: Petition of citizens of Urbana, Ill., protest-

ing against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 14, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE. The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. Burrows, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand ap-

proved.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDENT pro-tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 17th ultimo, a statement concerning buildings and quarters rented by the Navy Department in the District of Columbia and the States and Territories; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and